

Modern Philology

VOLUME XII

December 1914

NUMBER 6

A NOTE ON GUINIZELLI'S "AL COR GENTIL"

The first stanza of Guinizelli's *canzone Al cor gentil* is printed as follows in the critical edition of Casini:

Al cor gentil ripara sempre amore
com' a la selva augello in la verdura
nè fe' amore avanti gentil core,
nè gentil core avanti amor natura,
ch' adesso che fo' il sole
si tosto lo splendore fo' lucente
nè fo' avanti il sole;
e prende amore in gentilezza loco
così propiamente
como clarore in clarità di foco.¹

The readings of the three primary MSS for the last part of line 7 are as follows: Vat. 3793, *davanti sole*; Laur. Red. 9, *avantel sole*; Pal. 418, *davantil sole*.²

Two interpretations are current for line 7. Some critics, regarding *avanti* as an adverb and *sole* as the subject, take the line to mean:

Nor did the sun exist before.³

¹ *Le rime dei poeti bolognesi del secolo XIV*, ed. T. Casini (= *Scelta di curiosità lett. ined. o rare*, No. 185) (Bologna, 1881), p. 15.

² *Ed. cit.*, p. 249.

³ A. D'Ancona and D. Comparetti, *Le antiche rime volgari*, II (Bologna, 1881), 30, 31; G. Federzoni, *La canzone di Guido Guinizelli "Al cor gentil ripara sempre amore"* (Bologna, 1905), p. 6.

Others, regarding *avanti il sole* as a prepositional phrase, take the line to mean:

Nor did it [i.e., the light] exist before the sun.¹

Neither of these interpretations is quite satisfactory. The first offers a clear and straightforward thought-process, thus: love was not before the gentle heart, nor the gentle heart before love; the light was not before the sun, nor the sun before light. The trouble is that *avanti il sole* looks exactly like a prepositional phrase, and not at all like an independent adverb juxtaposed to a nominative article and noun. If the second interpretation be followed, on the other hand, line 7 seems merely a slight and needless variation of the idea of lines 5 and 6.

But Casini's reading *avanti il sole* is in itself unsatisfactory; for the rhyme it involves, *il sole*: *il sole*, is, as I shall show, extremely peculiar.²

Equivocal rhyme consists, by common definition, in the rhyming of two words identical in form but different in meaning.³ The requirement that the rhyme-words differ in meaning is, however, more or less relaxed, as will presently appear, in a number of instances in early Italian poetry. Equivocal rhyme may be used sporadically, that is, once or twice or somewhat oftener, in a poem in which the remaining rhymes are not equivocal; or it may be used consistently, with deliberate artistic purpose, throughout a poem, or in several lines of each stanza.

The use of equivocal rhyme in the Sicilian and Tuscan *canzoni* of the thirteenth century has been studied by Biadene.⁴ He lists about one hundred and fifty cases of sporadic equivocal rhyme. In nearly all of these cases the rhyme-words differ in meaning. There are, however, 23 cases in which Biadene finds no difference in

¹ D. G. Rossetti, *Italian Poets Chiefly before Dante* (Stratford-on-Avon, 1908), p. 42; A. Bongianni, *Guido Guinizelli e la sua riforma poetica* (Venice, 1896), p. 42.

² The accuracy of Casini's reading of line 7 was questioned, but not studied, by A. J. Butler, *The Forerunners of Dante* (Oxford, 1910), p. 250: "No variant to this line appears to exist, yet it is hardly possible to accept it exactly as it stands, as *sole* appears to be used in an identical sense with that of l. 5."

³ The first Italian definition, that of Antonio da Tempo (written in 1322), is as follows: "Et dicendum, quod equivocus est dictio vel dictiones compositae cum eadem voce et sonoritate et ex eiusdem literis, habentes plura et diversa significata" (*Delle rime volgari*, ed. G. Grion [Bologna, 1869], p. 160).

⁴ L. Biadene, "La rima nella canzone italiana dei secoli XIII e XIV," in *Raccolta di studi dedicati ad Alessandro D'Ancona* (Florence, 1901), pp. 730 ff.

meaning, though he remarks that in some of them another critic might find a difference.¹ In many of these cases the reading is uncertain. In 16 of the 23 cases the lines in question are transmitted in one MS only.² In several cases plausible corrections have been or might be proposed.³ In no case does a noun preceded by the definite article rhyme with the same noun preceded by the definite article.⁴

¹ Biadene lists 25 cases, but two of these are to be disregarded. 37 (in this and the following notes italicized numerals refer to poems according to their order in MS Vat. 3793; quotations are, unless otherwise indicated, from *Il libro de varie romanze volgare*, ed. F. Egidi [Rome, 1908]; and the line divisions and line numbers are, unless otherwise indicated, those of *Le antiche rime volgari*, ed. D'Ancona and Comparetti [Bologna, 1875-88]), lines 3 and 9, is not a case in point. Each of the lines ends with the word *dato*, but they fall in independent rhyme-groups, the rhyme -ato being used twice in this stanza, once in the *piedi*, and once in the *volta*, though the corresponding rhyme is not repeated in the other stanzas. For 180, lines 31 and 32, Biadene quotes the rhyme *matto: matto* from the 1828 edition of Guttone, but in the modern critical edition (*Fra Guttone d'Arezzo. Le rime*, ed. F. Pellegrini [Bologna, 1901], I, 348) the rhyme is [*n*]at^o: matto.

² The instances occur in 31, 33, 63, 70, 220, 230, 231, 232, 241, 279, 280, 285; cf. G. B. Festa, "Bibliografia delle più antiche rime volgari italiane," in *Romanische Forschungen*, XXV (1908), 564.

³ E.g., for 31, line 33, *durare*, Grion reads *dare* ("Il serventesse di Ciullo d' Alcamo," in *Il propagnatore*, IV [1871], Part I, 148). For 63, line 70, *mascondo*, one might read *nascondo*. See also the next note.

⁴ There is, however, one case in which an infinitive preceded by *al* rhymes with the same infinitive preceded by *al*, in 279 (Monte, *Nelcore agio unfoco*), lines 63 and 65: *sono alperire / comomo chesichuro / ua mare ede alperire*. This poem is transmitted in Vat. 3793 only.

The cases in which the equivocal rhyme-words are nouns are as follows: 38, 1 and 3: *Aamore jnchui disio edosperanza / . . . / eguardomi jnfino cheungnra lasperanza. Osperanza* is a verbal phrase equivalent to *espero*. Some editors have *fidanza*, a conjectural emendation, for the first *esperanza*. 63, 53 and 54 (I quote 52-55): *Rico sono delasperanza / puero dijina manza / sanami lafina amanza / quado la posso uedere*. In 53 *amanza* is abstract, in 54 it means "the beloved lady." Transmitted in Vat. 3793 only. 138, 46 and 49: *Pegio cheguerra assai reo se piuocomo / . . . / pche nōmpo tralglianimali como*. The first *omo* perhaps means "anyone"; the second, "man as distinct from the brutes." 150, 61 and 64 (I quote 61-65 from Guttone, ed. Pellegrini, pp. 319-20): *Foll' è chi fugge il suo prode e cher danno / e l' onor suo fa che vergogna i torna: / di bona libertà, or' e' sogniorno / a gran piacer, e' aduce, a suo gran danno, / Sotto [de] segnoria fella e maltrago*. The *danno* of the 61 is general, and is the antonym of *prode*; the *danno* of 64 is specific, and is the antonym of *piacer*. 155, 2 and 5 (I quote 1-5 from Guttone, ed. cit., p. 254): *Manta stagione veggio / Che l' omo è, senza colpa, / miso a dispregio grande, / E tal che colpa pande / ne ra sì com no 'n colpa*. MS Riccardiano 2533 reads for line 5, *ne se sicomo no! colpa* (ed. cit., loc. cit.). In this reading, which makes better sense than the accepted reading if *sicomo* be divided *sì e' omo*, the *colpa* appears as a verb. In the accepted reading *senza colpa* and 'n *colpa* are presumably to be regarded as phrasal units. 165, 47 and 48 (I quote 46-48 from Monaci, *Crestomazia italiana dei primi secoli* [Città di Castello, 1889], p. 181): *quale danno teria / se fere tute, onno dimonio, omni homo / fosse sora d' un omo? Omni homo* is perhaps regarded as a phrasal unit. The *homo* means "man as distinct from the brutes"; the *omo*, "a given individual." 241, 32 and 38: *madonna mante uolte / . . . / ma dipiù rade uolte*. *Mante uolte* is presumably regarded as a phrasal unit. Transmitted in Vat. 3793 only. 280, 58 and 60: *Dapoi chamore mapreso / comsi forte chatena / chio moro sedifeso / nomosso ditale chatena*. Vat. 3793 only. 296, 12 and 16: *chemi comsumma amorite sostenendo vita / . . . / piu chenaua jntempesta la mia vita*. Vat. 3793 only.

Biadene lists 20 *canzoni* as consistently equivocal. In these *canzoni* the constant equivocation becomes a *tour de force*, and in the special exigency the requirement of difference in meaning is more readily relaxed. In the great majority of cases the meaning still differs, but there are a number of instances in which the difference is very small or quite imperceptible.¹ Among these instances, however, there is but one case of a noun preceded by the definite article rhyming with the same noun preceded by the definite article. The poem in question is by an insignificant author, Finfo del Buono Guido Neri di Firenze, is transmitted in Vat. 3793 only, and is quite unintelligible.²

The sonnet of the same period, being regarded as less noble than the *canzone*, admitted in general a somewhat greater metrical license; but it does not differ notably from the *canzone* in the matter of equivocal rhyme.³

Guinizelli's rhyme *sole: sole* in the lines under discussion is an

¹ Cf. E. G. Parodi, "La rima e i vocaboli in rima nella *Divina Commedia*," in *Bulletino della Società dantesca italiana*, N.S., III (1895-96), 141-42.

² 198 (*Se longhuso mimena*), 38 and 41 (I quote 37-41): *Rengnatinsimal mano / chebene fato nel monte / che fue gis soma questa / ondalire dio malmanto / sonore nonai nelmonte.* There is one other case in which a noun preceded by the definite article rhymes with the same noun preceded by the definite article, but in this case the meaning of the noun varies clearly in the two instances: 289, 106 and 107 (I quote 106-8): *chesi crudele adoso o logiudicio / checredo chediqui aldie del giudicio / limici tormenti nonaueranno fine.* The *giudicio* means "suffering"; the *giudicio*, "the Last Judgment."

³ The use of sporadic equivocal rhyme in the sonnet of the thirteenth century has not been studied. Biadene ("Morfologia del sonetto nel sec. XIII e XIV," in *Studi di filologia romanza*, IV [1889], 155-56), mentions 50 consistently equivocal sonnets. (He lists 51 sonnets, but 768, which he includes, is not equivocal.) I have examined 42 of these sonnets (8 are inaccessible to me: that by Talano, the last 5 mentioned by Biadene under a, and the last 2 mentioned under b), and find the rhyme usage much like that in the consistently equivocal *canzoni*. There are three cases in which a noun preceded by the definite article rhymes with the same noun preceded by the definite article. In all three cases the article is preceded, in one or both of the two lines, by a preposition that unites with it, forming a distinctive case sign. The cases are as follows. 791, 1 and 3: *alamore: lamore.* Vat. 3793 only. 914, 3 and 5: *la fera: da la fera.* Vat. 3793 only. Bonagiunta da Lucca, *Chi va cherendo guerra, e lasso pace* (*Poeti del primo secolo* [ed. Valerianij] [Florence, 1816], I, 522), 10 and 13: *al core: nel core.* Not in any MS. First printed in *La bella mano* (fifteenth century). A fourth case, but a very doubtful one, appears in the sonnet of Dello da Siena, *Ser Chiaro, lo tuo dir d'ira non sale*, 10 and 13. These lines appear thus in MS Vat. 3214: *e bell e in ballo e ne lo gioco lasso / . . . / ma ueni uano e tosto riman lasso* (*Rime antiche italiane secondo la lezione del cod. vat. 3214*, ed. M. Pelaez [Bologna, 1895], p. 138). Valerian prints *e nello gioco l' asso* and *e torto riman l' asso* (*Poeti del primo secolo*, II, 158), but it seems more probable that the second *lasso* is the adjective. Another case appears in a consistently equivocal sonnet mentioned by Parodi (*loc. cit.*) but not by Biadene—882, 2, 4, and 5: *al campo: del campo: il campo.* Here, too, the article, in two of the three lines, is preceded by a preposition that unites with it, forming a distinctive case sign. In Vat. 3793 only.

instance of sporadic equivocal rhyme. There is no other case of equivocal rhyme in *Al cor gentil*. Six cases of sporadic equivocal rhyme occur in the other poems assigned by Casini to Guinizelli.¹ In each of these cases the rhyme-words in question differ in meaning.² In no case does a noun rhyme with itself.

In one poem of Guinizelli, *Canzone II, Lo fin pregio avanzato*,³ equivocal rhyme is used consistently. The poem is unintelligible. In no case does a noun preceded by the definite article rhyme with the same noun preceded by the definite article.

It would seem improbable, therefore, that Guinizelli allowed himself in the lines under discussion the rhyme *il sole: il sole*. The idea of differentiation persists throughout the use of equivocal rhyme. Even when the rhyme-words themselves do not differ in meaning there is at least a phrasal differentiation of some sort. But the definite article, when repeated with the same noun, by its very definiteness, makes against differentiation; and rhyme of the type *il sole: il sole* is therefore obviously contrary to the essential nature of equivocal rhyme. It is in particular highly improbable that Guinizelli allowed himself such a rhyme in this stanza—the opening stanza of a poem which, as the manifesto of a new poetic doctrine and method, must have been written with the utmost care.

I believe, accordingly, that the reading of Vat. 3793, *davanti sole*, is correct in its omission of the article. Line 7 would then read (accepting Casini's text for the first three words):

nè fo' avanti sole.

The insertion of the article in the other MSS may well have been the result of a scribal attempt at rectification.

The line is to be interpreted, I believe, thus:

Nor was there [any] sun before.

¹ *Canzoni I*, lines 46 and 47; 49 and 52; *IV*, 21 and 22; *Sonnets XV*, 4 and 7; *XX* 3 and 5; 4 and 8 (*ed. cit.*, pp. 5-42). This list does not include the two or three cases in which two rhyme-words identical in form occur in the same stanza but in unrelated rhyme-groups, in poems in which a rhyme of the *piedi* is, in one stanza but not in all stanzas, repeated in the *volta*: e.g., *Canzone III*, 1 and 9.

² The difference is slight in the first two cases. In I, 46, *di molto orgoglio a dire*, the *a dire* is a single verbal phrase of gerundive value; in 47, *chè s' eo voglio ver dire*, the *ver dire* is a single phrase meaning "to be truthful." In 49, *A pinger l' air son dato*, the *dato* means "engaged"; in 56, *lasso, ch' eo li fui dato*, the *dato* means "given." Moreover, *son dato* and *fui dato* were presumably regarded as unities.

³ *Ed. cit.*, p. 8.

With this reading and interpretation, the *sole* of line 7 differs from that of line 5 by its indefiniteness, the general concept "sun," "any sun," "luminary," standing against the particular concept "the sun." The difference is slight, to be sure, but it is just the sort of minor difference that appears in several of the instances of equivocal rhyme noted by Biadene. This interpretation is similar to the first of the two interpretations, cited above, of the line as printed by Casini. It offers the same clear thought-process as that interpretation, and is free from its defect, for *avanti sole* does not, like *avanti il sole*, give the impression of being a prepositional phrase rather than an adverb and noun juxtaposed.¹

I owe thanks to Professors Pietsch and Shaw and to Dr. Pietro Stoppani for valuable suggestions with regard to this article.

ERNEST H. WILKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ Another possible interpretation seems worth mention. The *sole* of line 7 may be taken as an adverb, and the line interpreted thus: "Nor did it [i.e., the light] exist before, separately." Only one instance of *sole* as an adverb has been lexically registered, the following passage from the translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* by Ser Arrigo Simintendi da Prato (fourteenth century): *E non basta sole ch' egli sia Giove: dia pegno d'amore s' egli sia Giove* (V. Nannucci, *Teorica dei nomi della lingua italiana* [Florence, 1858], p. 163; P. Petrucci, *Novo dizionario universale della lingua italiana*, s.v. "sole" [II, 980 *inf.*]). *Sole* is perhaps used in this way in Guinizelli's unintelligible equivocal *canzone*, *Lo fin pregio avanzato*, line 41. Lines 40-47 are as follows: *D'un' amorosa parte / me ren voler che sole / che in ver me più sole / che non fa la pantera, / che usa in una parte / che lerantisce sole / chè dì più color sole / so rizo che pantera* (ed. cit., p. 9). The *che sole* seems to represent *ch' è sole*. The existence of *sole* as an adverb is a priori probable. *Solo* appears very frequently in the apocopated form *sol*: and the completion of that form by a paragogic *e* would be entirely natural.

BALZAC AND THE SHORT-STORY

In his preface to *Argow le pirate*, otherwise known as *Annette et le criminel*,¹ Balzac writes as follows:

J'ose dire que cet ouvrage offrira de plus le mérite d'une autre difficulté vaincue, plus grande que les lecteurs ne sauraient l'imaginer, et qui ne peut être guère appréciée que par les auteurs eux-mêmes.

En général, l'on ne se tire d'affaire dans la composition d'un roman que par la multitude des personnages et la variété des situations, et l'on n'a pas beaucoup d'exemples de romans à deux ou trois personnages, restreints à une seule situation.

Dans ce genre, *Caleb Williams*, le chef-d'œuvre du célèbre Godwin, est, de notre époque, le seul ouvrage que l'on connaisse, et l'intérêt en est prodigieux. Le roman d'*Annette* ne contient, de même que dans *Williams*, que deux personnages marquants, et l'intérêt m'en a semblé assez fort, surtout au quatrième volume; mais j'en dis peut-être plus que la modestie, qui convient à un pauvre bachelier, ne le comporte; je m'arrête donc²

A fiction on this order, with only two or three characters, based upon a single situation, calls to mind the short-story, that form of brief narrative which has flourished so remarkably in the United States since Poe, and of which the evolution, in the case of English and American literature, has been so diligently studied.³ Were Balzac and his French contemporaries interested in such a form? France has an imposing short-story literature, yet little effort has

¹ Paris, E. Buisson, 1824, 4 vols. in 12. This is one of the unsigned *Œuvres de jeunesse*; cf. Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de Balzac*, 3d ed., 256.

² I, 15-16. This preface is reprinted in Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, 450-53.

³ For definitions of the short-story, cf. Brander Matthews, *The Philosophy of the Short-Story*, New York, 1901; H. S. Canby, *The Short Story*, New York, 1902; Bliss Perry, *A Study of Prose Fiction*, Boston, 1902; Clayton Hamilton, *Materials and Methods of Fiction*, New York, 1908. The somewhat narrow limits set by Poe, whose famous dictum in a review of *Twice Told Tales* is the point of departure for most students of short-story technique, are accepted in the present discussion. Poe's remarks, in part, are as follows (*Works*, New York, Crowell, 1902, XI, 108): "A skilful literary artist has constructed a tale. If wise, he has not fashioned his thoughts to accommodate his incidents; but having conceived, with deliberate care, a certain unique or single effect to be wrought out, he then invents such incidents—he then combines such events as may best aid him in establishing this preconceived effect. If his very initial sentence tend not to the outbring of this effect, then he has failed in his first step. In the whole composition there should be no word written, of which the tendency, direct or indirect, is not to the one pre-established design. And by such means, with such care and skill, a picture is at length painted which leaves in the mind of him who contemplates it with a kindred art, a sense of the fullest satisfaction."

For historical studies of the form, cf. H. S. Canby, *The Short Story in English*, New York, 1900; C. S. Baldwin, *American Short Stories*, New York, 1909; C. A. Smith, *The American Short Story*, Boston, 1912.

been made to trace the sources of the *genre* in that country; the most noteworthy contribution, Professor Baldwin's, in his Introduction to *American Short Stories*,¹ is, as he himself suggests, only a general survey, "pending further discussion."² Here appears to be a promising field of investigation, practically unworked. The following inquiry into the relation of Balzac to the short-story, prompted by the above-quoted remarks from *Argow le pirate*, represents merely an initial and tentative excursion into this new territory.

The reference to *Caleb Williams*, in Balzac's preface, is significant. He is correct in ascribing to Godwin's novel the interest that rests upon a vivid presentation of one situation; from beginning to end the attention is fastened upon the relations of Williams and the man who is first his patron and then his persecutor, Falkland, and, throughout, the action is based upon the unconfessed crime of the latter. The following comment in Godwin's preface shows how he himself valued the effect of such a structure:

I felt that I had a great advantage in thus carrying back my invention from the ultimate conclusion to the first commencement of the train of adventures upon which I purposed to employ my pen. An entire unity of plot would be the infallible result; and the unity of spirit and interest in a tale truly considered gives it a powerful hold on the reader which can scarcely be generated with equal success in any other way.³

This method savors of Poe's "deliberately preconceived effect," and it is interesting to note, in passing, that Poe, in *The Philosophy of Composition*, written in 1846, refers to the structure of *Caleb Williams* and comments on the type of novel built to produce a single, vivid impression.⁴

But Balzac's novel, in spite of his ambition, is less successful than Godwin's. While its basis is the love of the bewitching Annette

¹ See note 3, p. 71.

² The following must also be mentioned: Una A. Taylor, "The Short Story in France, 1800-1900," *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1913 (the emphasis is on content, not on form, and the word short-story is not used in the narrow technical sense); W. M. Hart, "The Narrative Art of the Old French Fabliaux," *Killidge Anniversary Papers*, Boston, 1913 (Professor Hart establishes the fact that the *fabliaux*, in their technique, are forerunners of the short-story); J. B. Esenwein, *Studying the Short Story*, New York, 1912 (an interesting reference [p. xx] to the brief tales of Balzac); F. Brunetière, "Little French Masterpieces," Introduction to the Balzac volume, New York, 1903; Spielhagen, "Beiträge zur Theorie und Technik des Romans" (*Roman oder Novelle?* VII), Leipzig, 1883.

³ *Caleb Williams*, London, Routledge, 1903, p. xviii. It should be stated that, while the date of *Caleb Williams* is 1794, this preface was not written until 1832 and of course could not have been known to Balzac when he wrote *Argow le pirate*.

⁴ *Works*, XIV, 193.

for a fierce but kind-hearted pirate, there are so many other characters and so many extraneous events that the impression of unity is obscured. An item worth noting, however, is the fact that Balzac occasionally feels the lack of concision and stops the narrative, in accordance with what is later his constant practice, in order to apologize to the reader.¹ One remark, at the end of the novel, where, after reporting the demise of the lovers, Balzac allows himself to discourse on the fates of the other characters, deserves quotation:

Ainsi qu'au théâtre, lorsqu'une fois le noeud d'un drame est tranché, il devient tellement impossible de réussir à intéresser, qu'on a fait une loi de cesser à l'instant; mais la curiosité des lecteurs ne seroit pas satisfaite si je n'achevois pas de donner le détail des actions du lieutenant, qui, toutes criminelles et horribles qu'elles soient, ont un genre d'intérêt pour certains lecteurs. Alors il sera loisible à celui qui ne s'intéresse qu'à Annette et au Criminel d'en rester là. Ceux qui voudront tout connaître n'auront qu'à poursuivre.²

Evidently, the author still had in mind the unity which he set out to produce.

The preface is more important than the novel. It is of considerable interest that as early as 1824—Professor Baldwin finds the first French short-story in 1836—Balzac deliberately attempts the peculiar singleness of effect which later becomes the chief *desideratum* of the short-story. Furthermore, Balzac's comprehension of the principle involved, and his discernment in selecting *Caleb Williams* as an example, are proven by the statements of Godwin and Poe concerning the unity of *Caleb Williams*, and it is clear that his remarks represent, not a vague generalization, but an opinion that is well defined.

The other compositions grouped as Balzac's *Oeuvres de jeunesse*³ are in no way suggestive; they may therefore be dismissed at once and the attention directed to the products of the author's maturity. Several of his narratives of the years 1830-32 deserve notice, and the next step will be to examine these, in chronological order, and to point out whatever is of interest from the point of view of short-story technique.

¹ II, 100, 243, 250-51.

² IV, 212.

³ Cf. the following works by Lovenjoul: *Histoire des œuvres de Balsac*, 3d ed., 255-56; *Une page perdue de Balsac*, Paris, 1903, 135-67.

The first is *Une passion dans le désert* (1830). After a brief introduction, in which, apropos of wild-animal training, the tale of the old soldier is brought up, a curt sentence starts the exposition:

Lors de l'expédition entreprise dans la haute Égypte par le général Desaix, un soldat provençal, étant tombé au pouvoir des Maugrabs, fut emmené par ces Arabes dans les déserts situés au delà des cataractes du Nil.¹

By the end of the first paragraph we have been told how the soldier escapes on a horse, rides the horse to death, and finds himself helpless in the middle of the desert. This is a good beginning; we are now acquainted with the hero and the setting. In view of Poe's requirement that the very first part of the narrative be constructed with an eye to the single preconceived effect of the whole, the directness with which Balzac sets out is striking, and, even if he lack the supreme skill of the American, he achieves here, as well as in certain other cases, an able initial paragraph. Following a description of the beauty and the dreadful solitude of the desert, the despair of the soldier is put with that concision which is a prime factor in the short-story: "Le Provençal avait vingt-deux ans, il arma sa carabine."² But he postpones suicide, finds a shelter, fells a palm tree so as to put a barrier at its entrance—and at this point there is a ring of foreboding in the narrator's voice:

Quand, vers le soir, ce roi du désert tomba, le bruit de sa chute retentit au loin, et il y eut une sorte de gémissement poussé par la solitude; le soldat en frémît comme s'il eût entendu quelque voix lui prédire un malheur.³

Here Balzac is employing an accredited short-story device, suggesting the characteristic tone of the narrative and thereby intensifying the totality of effect. In the night the man awakes and discovers at his side in the cave a panther. There follows a graphic and plausible enough description of the taming of the beast. The situation during the ensuing days, when the man's impulse to plunge a knife into the creature is several times blocked by her trustfulness, is made exceedingly tense, and there is a careful ordering of the incidents with a view to bringing the suspense to a head. At length, in their games, the panther suddenly shows irritation and starts to bite and is instantly killed by her companion, who at once regrets his haste in resenting what may have been simply playfulness. The

¹ *Oeuvres complètes, édition définitive*, XII, 312.

² XII, 314.

³ XII, 315.

narrative ends tersely: "Et les soldats qui avaient vu mon drapeau, et qui accoururent à mon secours, me trouvèrent tout en larmes."¹

With this dramatic close Balzac completes the requirements, and it becomes clear that at least one of his compositions possesses that harmony, resting upon a well-arranged series of incidents leading to a single decisive act, which constitutes a successful short-story. The harmony, moreover, is increased, the whole is closer knit, thanks to the fact that the soldier constantly compares the panther to womankind, and, more specifically, to a former mistress of his. Before leaving this narrative a difference in editions must be noticed. Whereas in the first edition there is the swift *dénouement* above described, in the *édition définitive*² four extra paragraphs are inserted immediately before the final solution; here the lady, to whom the story is being told, and the narrator converse about the outcome of the adventure. The resultant heightening of the suspense becomes an irritation, and the more direct culmination in the first edition is better. Furthermore, in the first edition the final sentence of the story stands, as it should, at the end of a paragraph, and the conclusion, a kind of envoy which Balzac attaches, begins with a fresh paragraph. There is no such division in the *édition définitive*, and the finality of the narrative proper is consequently less complete.

In *Jésus-Christ en Flandre* (1831), there is added to the main narrative an account of a vision which the author has in a church near the scene of the story, but this fragment, which originally appeared separately under the title *L'Église*, and which was not appended until 1845,³ is in no way essential⁴ and may in the present consideration be wholly disregarded. The subject is a miracle: Christ saves the lives of those who have sufficient faith to walk with him across a tempestuous sea. The preparation for the single climactic moment when the miracle takes place is skilful. A feeling is created at the outset that the last traveler to board the ferry is no ordinary person—and that perhaps his joining the company for this trip, when a storm is brewing, is no ordinary event. Frequent

¹ XII, 324. In the first edition (*Revue de Paris*, December, 1830), the ending reads: "me trouvèrent tout en larmes—évanoui."

² XII, 324.

³ Cf. Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, 177.

⁴ Cf. *Modern Language Notes*, XXIX, 20: "The last third [of *Jésus-Christ en Flandre*] is open to criticism as having hardly any connection with the plot."

repetitions of this *motif* help in holding the narrative true to its course. During the approach of the storm the reader is completely informed as to the characteristics of the passengers, so that he is ready to focus his gaze, with full appreciation, upon their behavior in face of peril. The manner in which Balzac suggests the supernatural, and his general method of presentation, call to mind what Professor Baldwin, speaking of American short-stories, terms static art. Of Poe, Professor Baldwin writes:

he gained his own peculiar triumphs in the static—in a situation developed by exquisite gradation of such infinitesimal incidents as compose *Berenice* to an intense climax of emotional suggestion, rather than in a situation developed by gradation of events to a climax of action.¹

In Balzac's tale, the climax is certainly one of action, but the preparation consists of a deliberate adjustment of the setting with an eye to the selection of such details as will emphasize the meaning of this action; there are few events before the decisive one. In other words, the static and the kinetic are combined. The subject, I think, does not lend itself to short-story treatment as readily as that of *Une passion dans le désert*, yet the structure undoubtedly warrants the classification of this narrative as an example of the type under discussion, the second to be found in Balzac by 1831.

The theme of *La grande Bretèche* (1832)² suggests that of Poe's *The Cask of Amontillado* (1846), an impeccable short-story. The unique effect, in both compositions, rests upon the narration of an act of vengeance: one man murders another by shutting him up behind a wall of solid masonry; in Poe the cause for revenge is not specified, in Balzac a husband thus punishes a lover. It must be explained at the outset that Balzac's story consists of three parts, and that for the present comparison the first two may be dismissed with a word. The interest, throughout, is in the mystery of a certain deserted house: after an introductory description sounding a note of gloom, the first part shows that the abandonment of the estate has been decreed by the will of the deceased countess, without revealing her motive, the second vaguely suggests an explanation by a reference to a Spaniard who may have been the lover, and the third

¹ P. 22.

² *La grande Bretèche* is published by Jessup and Canby, with a page of comment, in *The Book of the Short Story*, New York, 1912.

part is a complete solution. The whole is harmonious, and illustrates the possibilities of a short-story based upon a process of ratiocination, as suggested by Poe,¹ with the interest depending upon the manner in which the man who exposes the mystery accumulates and arranges his data, but it is somewhat long and detailed, with an occasional short digression. The third section, which consists of the tale of Rosalie, the maid of the countess, is more compact than the other parts, is in itself complete, and affords an excellent opportunity for comparison with the work of Poe, the master craftsman. The first and second parts contribute largely to the suspense, yet no violence is done to the structure when the third part is considered separately.

Poe's beginning illustrates admirably his principle that the initial sentence shall tend to the outbring of the single effect of the story:

The thousand injuries of Fortunato I had borne as I best could, but when he ventured upon insult I vowed revenge.²

With Balzac, the start is direct enough, but cumbersome:

La chambre que Madame de Merret occupait à la Bretèche était située au rez-de-chaussée. Un petit cabinet de quatre pieds de profondeur environ, pratiqué dans l'intérieur du mur, lui servait de garde-robe.³

It will be seen later that the closet is essential to the story, but the forced and clumsy allusion to it in the second sentence is utterly different from Poe's reference, at once casual and natural, to the niche in the wall, which, in his tale, plays the corresponding rôle. The remainder of Balzac's initial paragraph is well done: he proceeds to tell how, one evening, the husband comes home late, enters his wife's chamber, and is caused to suspect, by her manner and by a noise as if a door had been shut just before his arrival, that somebody is hidden in the closet. The action is rapid: the wife swears innocence, the husband's suspicions grow, he sends for a mason and has the closet walled up during the night, and stays with his wife constantly for several weeks. Whenever there is a sound in the closet and the wife begs for mercy, he answers—and this sentence closes the narrative: "Vous avez juré sur la croix qu'il n'y avait là personne."⁴ It is clear from a remark which Balzac makes else-

¹ *Works*, XI, 109.

² *Ibid.*, VI, 167.

³ *Oeuvres*, IV, 577.

⁴ IV, 583.

where that he valued the dramatic quality of this final scene.¹ Certainly it is as effective as Poe's: "Against the new masonry I re-erected the old rampart of bones. For the half of a century no mortal has disturbed them. *In pace requiescat!*"²

Balzac's structure is skilful, especially at the climax, but the main part of Poe's story is in two ways superior. Poe's totality of effect is enhanced by the simplicity of the plot, which is such that there are only two characters and that the action flows steadily in a single direction and ends in a swift catastrophe. In *La grande Bretèche*, such incidents have been chosen that the introduction of several subsidiary characters is required and the *dénouement* is less sudden, and the result, although the unity is excellent, is second to Poe's. Again, in the *Cask of Amontillado*, the unity of tone is heightened, the note of menace and the suggestion of revenge are maintained, by the introduction of such details as Montresor's drinking to the long life of Fortunato, who is to become his victim, and his reference to the family motto, *Nemo me impune lacescit*. In *La grande Bretèche* there is no such device, although Balzac uses it elsewhere.

Poe's is a better short-story. The point is that while Balzac has not been supremely successful—and no one would attempt to set him up as a rival to Poe—and while it has been necessary to lift this story bodily out of its context, yet this is a narrative which meets the requirements of the short-story type.³

A discussion of *La femme abandonnée* (1832) may well consist of a comparison with Gautier's *La morte amoureuse*, which is nearly contemporary (1836) and which is named by Professor Baldwin as a genuine short-story—and the first one in France. *La morte amoureuse* deals with the *liaison* of a priest and a female vampire; it is fantastic after the manner of Hoffmann, and herein utterly different from Balzac's composition, but it closely resembles the latter in the fact that the interest is sharply focussed upon the relation of one man and one woman. With Balzac, as with Gautier,

¹ *La muse du département*, VI, 437. In Balzac's *Lettres à l'étrangère*, II, 420, we read: "ces petites terminaisons, comme *David Séchard*, qui coûtent plus cher à l'écrivain que de bons faciles sujets neufs." Evidently Balzac feels that the bringing a story to a successful close is as difficult as it is desirable.

² VI, 175.

³ It should be added that a comparison of earlier versions of the story with the *édition définitive*, reveals in the latter several important omissions and several minor ones, particularly in the first and second parts of the story, the effect of which is greater concision.

the action begins at once: a young Parisian, convalescent, is sent to the home of a country cousin, finds the society dull, and becomes eager to make the acquaintance of Madame de Beauséant, who is living in seclusion in the neighborhood since her abandonment by her lover, Ajuda-Pinto. He is sufficiently naïve and clever to win her affection, and they live happily together for a number of years, until the man is persuaded into a marriage of expediency. The final separation is ultimately followed by the man's suicide.

La morte amoureuse is, without reservation, short-story in form, and *La femme abandonnée* is not, yet the basic narrative of the latter is just as susceptible of short-story treatment. Balzac has not attained, very likely did not seek, the necessary compactness. Much space is devoted, at the outset, to a description of provincial society life; the account is shrewd and advances the narrative in that it prepares the reader to understand how ready the bored Parisian becomes for the relief of an interesting woman, yet this last effect a modern short-story writer would have secured with much greater economy of words, and any others he would have disregarded. Occasional slighter pauses for similar Balzacian comment are open to like criticism. At the point where the *liaison* is broken, the action is not swift enough; there is a lack of the terseness essential to the short-story once the climax is passed, a terseness not unlike that required in dramatic writing and mentioned by Balzac apropos of *Argow le pirate*.¹ Here the fault lies in the subject-matter rather than in Balzac's presentation;² the turning back of this man to his mistress could be only a gradual process, whereas, in *La morte amoureuse*, a single visit to the tomb of the woman suffices to precipitate an entirely plausible catastrophe. The two stories exemplify the point made by Mr. Clayton Hamilton that the material of the short-story must be more striking than that of the novel, the short-story writer not having "sufficient time at his disposal to reveal the full human significance of the commonplace."³ And it is clear that the task of giving artistic unity to a fiction based upon the commonplace was a severe one for Balzac, for he writes in a letter to Madame

¹ See p. 000, n. 0.

² Yet the responsibility, from the short-story point of view, is still Balzac's. Cf. the quotation from Poe, p. 71, n. 3.

³ *Materials and Methods of Fiction*, p. 178.

Hanska: "Les événements sont si difficiles à coördonner, quand on veut rester *vrai*."¹ The realist is not pre-eminently fitted to construct short-stories; his *modus operandi* is frequently the reverse of that prescribed by Poe,² and the degree of unity which he attains is almost inevitably less striking. Balzac's stories become less suggestive of the type under discussion as they become more realistic, and if he were the unalloyed realist sometimes conceived, there would be less reason for studying his relation to the short-story, but there is enough of the romantic and even of the melodramatic in his writing to compel attention here.

The ending of *La femme abandonnée* is quite as successful as Gautier's; the latter writes of the vampire: "Elle se dissipa dans l'air comme une fumée, et je ne la revis plus,"³ while Balzac says: "M. de Nueil passa dans un boudoir attenant au salon, où il avait mis son fusil en revenant de la chasse, et se tua."⁴ The concision and finality of each are all they should be. In each a moral follows, and from the short-story viewpoint Gautier is superior, for in a single short paragraph, with the effect of the tale still wholly fresh, he develops the priestly injunction: "Ne regardez jamais une femme," while Balzac, for his comment upon the position of the man and the woman and the inevitable result of the man's marriage, requires five times as much space—and at such a point mere physical dimensions are significant. Here, as elsewhere in the story, the nature of the subject—soul analysis, and not romanticism after the manner of Gautier—and Balzac's love for details and explanations, block what could easily be made a successful short-story. I have considered *La femme abandonnée* at length because it is a short-story *manqué*, a near short-story, so to speak, because it suggests Gautier's expert production, and because it illustrates so aptly the conflict of the short-story and realism.

Of these four narratives, the first three, I think, are short-stories. It is upon them, and upon the preface of 1824, that an estimate of Balzac's significance in the history of the *genre* must be based. The material which follows, although in general it corroborates the impression already made, is here offered largely in the interest of completeness.

¹ *Lettres à l'étangère*, II, 178.

² See p. 71, n. 3.

³ *Nouvelles*, Paris, Charpentier, 1871, p. 295.

⁴ III, 78.

Of the other brief tales, many appear suggestive on account of certain details, an effective beginning or ending, an adroit economy in construction, but none requires long consideration here.¹ Of the *Contes drolatiques*, the majority of which have a Rabelaisian fluidity of style remote from the short-story manner, four are clearly short-story in conception, if not in execution. These are: *La belle Impéria*, *La mye du roy*, *La pucelle de Thilouze*, *Le frère d'armes*. Yet not one of these completely satisfies; in each the effectiveness is somehow clogged, the impetus deflected, and the result is not precisely what Poe and his successors demand. This is by no means equivalent to saying that the tales would be more artistic had they been made fully to conform to these particular requirements; the type under discussion is not necessarily excellent above all others, and many a good narrative could be fitted to its conditions only by mutilation. Among the longer fictions, several written during the period of maturity, such as *Le curé de Tours*, *L'Enfant maudit*, *Ursule Mirouet*, and *Le lys dans la vallée*, possess in some degree that unity to which Balzac refers in 1824 as a *desideratum*.

La muse du département is of special interest because it is patterned upon Benjamin Constant's *Adolphe*,² of which the singleness of effect is so complete. It has been seen that, in his preface to *Argow le pirate*, Balzac suggested that, of contemporary novels, *Caleb Williams* was the only one possessing the unity which he describes. He might well have mentioned *Adolphe* (1816),³ of which Constant himself says that it was written to persuade several friends "de la possibilité de donner une sorte d'intérêt à un roman dont les personnages se réduisaient à deux, et dont la situation serait toujours la même."⁴ Later, Balzac admires *Adolphe*,⁵ refers to "ces délicieux

¹ Cf. *La paix du ménage*, *Le message*, *Le chef-d'œuvre inconnu*, *Le cornac de Carlsruhe* (*Œuvres*, pp. 271-73).

Is an album of notes by Balzac, published under the title: *Pensées, sujets, fragments* (Paris, Blaizot, 1910), are several outlines of plots which would have served for capital short-stories. Cf. pp. 77-78, 86-87 (these two outlines are found, treated as amplified anecdotes, in Balzac's *Échantillon de causerie française*, XX, pp. 300-302 and 313-15, respectively); p. 126, *L'Original*. Professor Canby, in *The Short Story*, p. 16, points out similar "motifs and suggestions for stories" in Hawthorne's *American Note-Books*.

² Cf. *Lettres à l'étrangère*, II, 126.

³ Le Breton (*Balzac*, Paris, 1905, p. 76) thinks that at this time (1824) Balzac had not read *Adolphe*.

⁴ *Adolphe*, Paris, 1864, pp. 29-30 (Préface de la troisième édition). ⁵ Cf. XXII, 517.

in-dix-huit nommés *Adolphe, Paul et Virginie*,¹ as if approving the compactness of the story, and at length uses *Adolphe* as a model. *La muse du département* possesses only relative unity. Balzac makes a capital effort to secure the effect described in his early preface, and it is interesting that at this later point in his career (1843) he has not lost sight of the value of such a method of composition, yet the novel lacks that harmony which Constant attains by riveting the attention upon the man and the woman, by omitting physical descriptions—of which Balzac is so fond—and creating few subsidiary characters, and which makes of *Adolphe* a nearly perfect short-story, *Adolphe*, which was written twenty years before Gautier's *La morte amoureuse*.

No remarks of the weight of those in the preface to *Argow* exist in Balzac's later critical comment. One or two bear out what he said in 1824. In a review, written in 1840, of Cooper's *Lac Ontario*,² he says: "J'aime ces sujets simples, ils annoncent une grande force de conception, et sont toujours pleins de richesses."³ And in the same number of the *Revue parisienne*, he utters a criticism against complex plots and too many events in a novel,⁴ but what he champions in this case is not so much greater unity as greater attention to character study.⁵ Balzac speaks with enthusiasm of what he names the *conte*,⁶ and extols those who have excelled as *conteurs*,⁷ but as far as can be determined from the list of writers which he adds, what he prizes is simply supreme skill in narration. Certainly short-story writing, practiced as an art, requires such narrative power, but so do other forms of fiction equally estimable. Balzac's realization of the vagueness of the term *conte* may be gauged by the following remark, made apropos of *Melmoth réconcilié*: "Ce conte, pour nous servir de l'expression à la mode et sous laquelle on confond tous les travaux de l'auteur, de quelque nature qu'ils puissent être."⁸ And, as to this laxness, Balzac is not unlike his contempor-

¹ XXII, 508.

² Balzac means *The Pathfinder*, of which the simplicity of plot is striking.

³ XXIII, 585.

⁴ XXIII, 578.

⁵ Cf., however, XXIII, 733: "La loi dominatrice est l'unité dans la composition; que vous placiez cette unité, soit dans l'idée mère, soit dans le plan, sans elle il n'y a que confusion" (of *La chartreuse de Parme*).

⁶ XXII, 386; XXIII, 754; Lovenjoul, *Page perdue de Balzac*, p. 69.

⁷ *Pensées, sujets, fragments*, p. 18.

⁸ XXII, 417.

ries, for there are a number of instances where he uses the words *conte*, *nouvelle*, and *roman* without distinction.¹

The net result of this investigation is to demonstrate that Balzac took a lively interest in that kind of fiction of which the ultimate development is the short-story, and that he himself wrote several genuine short-stories. A more convincing case could be made out for Balzac, if I marshaled the material differently, offering first the negative evidence, and reserving for the end the presentation of those facts which make it necessary to set aside the verdict of Professor Baldwin that Balzac's "handling does not seem . . . directive."² But a chronological arrangement is more satisfactory, as being absolutely judicial, as emphasizing that Balzac was most interested in highly unified narrative during the early part of his career, at a time when it has been supposed the short-story was not born in France, and, incidentally 'before Balzac became a deep-dyed realist, thus bearing out the view that the short-story is pre-eminently a form for the romanticist.

While it may be accepted as a matter of fact that several of Balzac's compositions have the general structure demanded of a narrator who desires "to produce a single narrative effect with the greatest economy of means that is consistent with the utmost emphasis,"³ conclusions must be less precise when the more elastic requirements, such as conciseness of style, are considered. It is sure that the clean-cut exactness of Poe contributed to the success of his tales and that Balzac's clumsiness hindered effectual compression;⁴ it is sure that Balzac did not possess the gift of epithet which so distinguished Stevenson; but we promptly reach a point where the problem becomes a matter of purely subjective literary criticism, and speculation of that nature will not settle a point in literary history.

¹ Balzac applies the term *nouvelle* to *Illusions perdues* (*Lettres à l'étrangère*, I, 337), to *Cousin Pons* (XXIV, 517), to "la fin de *Beatriz*" (*Lettres à l'étrangère*, II, 391). He calls *La peau de chagrin* a *conte* (XXI, 494), *Masseilla Doni* a *roman* (XXIV, 281).

² Pp. 32-33. With Professor Baldwin's characterization of four of Balzac's short pieces, I agree heartily.

³ Clayton Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

⁴ Not to mention the pressure brought to bear upon him by publishers, and his own interest in money-making. Cf. *Lettres à l'étrangère*, II, 176: "La rapidité du travail m'ôte le sens de la composition; je n'y vois plus clair, je ne sais plus ce que je fais"; *ibid.*, p. 6: "que pour avoir de l'argent pour moi, pour ma vie, il faut que j'écrive des nouvelles." Cf. Le Breton, *op. cit.*, chap. viii.

And, in any case, no one would seek to prove that Balzac was a great short-story artist; there appear to have been none in France until several decades later. But he contributed not a little to that groping after a new form which was evident before 1850. In an article on Poe in the *Revue des deux mondes* for October 15, 1846,¹ is a survey of the status of the brief narrative in France at that time, with a reference to the growing taste for compositions that are "simples, laconiques, savamment concentrées."² It is suggested that this is merely a backward swing of the pendulum, a return of such *contes* as Voltaire's *Candide*. The impression of a student of English and American short-stories would be—with due respect for the difficulty of measuring "the currents, the depths and the tideways . . . of literary forms," as Professor Bliss Perry puts it³—that the development of highly unified brief tales in France during this period is more than a matter of action and reaction, that it is the genesis of a comparatively new literary form. There is evidently no sharp dividing line, such as we have in English, in the "perpetually quoted" remarks of Poe. There is evidently a connection, in French as in English and American literature,⁴ between such novels as Balzac praises in 1824 and the short-story, and it is likely that the influence of Constant's *Adolphe*, which represents a distinct effort to concentrate, and of such narratives as *Paul et Virginie*, *Atala* and *René*, is by no means negligible. Furthermore it is probable that since the type reached maturity in France it has not been confined within the limits set by Poe, but has been handled after the manner of the German *Novelle*, wherein the stress is upon the "nature of the content," rather than upon "the story's outward form."⁵ But such opinions must remain conjectural until substantiated by minute examination of all the short-story literature of France.

HORATIO E. SMITH

YALE UNIVERSITY

¹ There is no reason to think that Balzac was acquainted with Poe, although the first French translation of Poe appeared as early as 1846 (Lauvrière, *Poe*, Paris, 1904, p. 726). Balzac did not read English.

² P. 366.

³ *Study of Prose Fiction*, p. 331.

⁴ Cf. Canby, *The Short Story*, p. 21.

⁵ *Modern Language Notes*, XXIX, 40. Such a tendency is exemplified by Balzac in *Adieu*, which, though lacking the compression of the narratives above analyzed, achieves, as the result of developing a somewhat elaborate structure about a single nucleus, a unity quite as artistic. Another example is Balzac's *Le succube* (*Contes drôlatiques*).

DENIS PIRAMUS: "LA VIE SEINT EDMUNT"

The only known MS extant of *La vie Seint Edmunt* of Denis Piramus is in the British Museum (Cott. MS Domit. A. XI) written in a hand of the thirteenth century.¹ The *Vie Seint Edmunt* numbers three complete editions:² the first by Thomas Arnold, in the *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, 1892, in the *Rolls Series*,³ the second by Florence Leftwich Ravenel in *Bryn Mawr College Monographs*, 1906;⁴ the third is included in the *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi* edited by Lord Francis Hervey, New York, 1907. This is based upon a new copy of the MS made under the supervision of Mr. J. A. Herbert of the British Museum.⁵

The present work on the language of Denis Piramus rests mainly upon Lord Hervey's edition; the two others have also been carefully compared.

As it is stated by the author (ll. 3261 ff.), the French *Life of Saint Edmund* is a translation from English and Latin originals. The Latin sources most probably are:

1. From the end of the prologue to l. 432, Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia regum Britanniae*, chiefly Book I, 16; Book XII, 15, 16, 19; Book VI, 15, 16, etc.; and Abbo of Fleury's *Passio*.⁶
2. From ll. 433 to 2018, *De infantia Sancti Eadmundi*, by Galfridus de Fontibus, written in the time of Abbot Ording, between 1148 and 1156.⁷

¹ For another French *Life of Saint Edmund*, cf. Paul Meyer, *Hist. litt. de la France*, XXXIII, 346, and *Romania*, XXXVI, 533 ff.

² The prologue of the poem was published by F. Michel in his *Rapports au ministre* in the *Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France*, pp. 258-61, Paris 1839, and also by H. L. D. Ward in the *Catalogue of Romances*, I, 701 ff.

³ Reviewed by G. Paris, *Romania*, XXII, 170.

⁴ Reviewed by T. A. Jenkins, *Modern Language Notes*, XXII (1907), 194-96; by E. Faral, *Romania*, XLI, 446; by J. Vising, *Vollmöller's kritischer Jahresbericht*, XII, I, 211, II, 135; by Ed. Stengel, *ibid.*, IX, I, 145; and by J. Bonnard, *ibid.*, X, II, 106.

⁵ Reviewed by J. Vising, *Vollmöller's kritischer Jahresbericht*, XII, II, 136.

⁶ Cf. *Memorials*, I, 6-7.

⁷ Cf. *Memorials*, I, 93-103; and *Introd.*, pp. xxxiv and xxxv.

3. From ll. 2019 to 3260, *Passio Sancti Eadmundi*, by Abbo of Fleury, composed near the end of the eleventh century.¹

4. From ll. 3261 to 3696, *Liber de miraculis Sancti Eadmundi*, by Herman the archdeacon, who probably was a monk at Bury.²

5. From l. 3697 to the end, Denis Piramus gives an account of Sweyn's invasion which is different from that of Herman. Outside of the *Saxon Chronicles* and Florence mentioned by Arnold,³ he may have drawn his material from Symeon of Durham, *Historia regum*,⁴ or from Henry, archdeacon of Huntingdon,⁵ or finally from a compilation made between 1148 and 1161 and known in the monastic world as the *Historia Saxonum vel Anglorum post obitum Bedae*.⁶

Thus far nothing is known of the English sources which Denis Piramus may have used. We have, however, in old English, a version of Abbo de Fleury's *Passion of Saint Edmund* by Aelfric, edited by Skeat, *Early English Text Society*, 1900, and reprinted in Lord Francis Hervey's *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi*, p. 60; yet, judging from the contents, the Latin original is the more probable source. As regards some possible English source of the *De infantia*, Arnold remarks⁷ that "there must have been an English version of the *Infancy* lying before him, which is not now extant. This English *Life* may perhaps be indicated by some one among the titles of the works on the Edmundian story, not now existing, which are written on the margin of MS Bodl. 240,⁸ e.g., the book of Bliburgh or *Alia Legenda*, or Nicholaus of Warengford, or H. Norwicensis."

We have no right to question the author's own statement as regards his use of English sources. Various details and passages which do not occur in the Latin may possibly have stood in the English. Considering the Latin sources only, Denis appears to have

¹ Cf. *Memorials*, I, 3-25, and Introd., pp. xxii-xxiv.

² Cf. *Memorials*, I, 26-92, and Introd., pp. xxviii-xxix.

³ Cf. *Memorials*, II, 242 and 240, notes.

⁴ Cf. *Simeonis Monachi opera omnia*, II, 139 ff., ed. by Arnold, London, 1885, Rolls Series.

⁵ Cf. *History of the English*, Book VI, chap. iii ff., pp. 175 ff., ed. by Arnold, London, 1879, Rolls Series.

⁶ Cf. W. Stubbs, *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden*, I, xxvi, London, 1868, Rolls Series; this *Historia Saxonum* appears almost *literatim* in Roger of Hoveden's own *Chronicles*. Cf. W. Stubbs, *op. cit.*, I, xxvii, and 71 ff.

⁷ Cf. *Memorials*, II, 228, note.

⁸ *Memorials*, I, Introd., lxvi.

made a clever paraphrase of his original, and a good part of originality in handling his material must therefore be conceded to him. While he preserves the main outline, Denis adds interesting details or passages, as for instance, descriptions of sea-voyages (cf. ll. 175-218, 1365-1492, 2029-52, etc.), of battles (cf. ll. 3749-3849, etc.), enumerations (cf. ll. 83, 811, 965, 2877, etc.), dialogues (cf. ll. 857, 925, 1015, 1308, 1332, etc.); he introduces appropriate changes (cf. the messenger's speech and Edmund's reply, ll. 2247, 2303, 2319), and, as was to be expected in a work which was intended primarily to be recited, Denis indulges in lengthy narratives and in repetitions.

With regard to the foundation of St. Edmund's legend, Lord Hervey's illuminating preface to the *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi* ought to be consulted.

The Abbey of St. Edmund's Bury, a convent of Benedictine monks, became so prominent that most chroniclers between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries make mention of it.¹ Its celebrity was not confined to England: Crestien de Troyes bears witness to this fact in the prologue to *Guillaume d'Angleterre* (ll. 11-17):

Qui les estoires d'Angleterre
Voldroit ancerchier et anquerre,
Une, qui mout fet bien a croire
Par ce que pleisanz est et voire,
An troveroit a Saint Esmoing. [variant: Esmont C.]
Se nus m'an demande tesmoing,
La l'aille querre se il viaut.

Wace also mentions it in several passages:

Cil de Surree e de Sussesse
De Saint Edmund e de Sufoc
E de Norwiz e de Norfoc.

—*R. de Rou*, III, ll. 7736-38.

and also with regard to Sweyn's death:

Ceo dient cil de Saint Aedmund,
Ki en lur livres escrit l'unt,
Ke Saint Aedmund le flaela
Pur ses terres, que il greva.

—*R. de Rou*, III, ll. 1315-18.

¹ Cf. *Memorials*, I, xii. Only facts which concern the 12th century and bear upon our subject are mentioned here.

Jordan Fantosme tells us:

Kar n'ad meilleur viandier de Saint Edmund en terre.

—*Chronique*, 1005.

Crestien de Troyes mentions St. Edmund's Abbey as the place where his *estoire* was found, and he adds: *La matiere si me conta, Uns miens compainz, Rogiers, li cointes, Qui de maint preudome est acointes* (*Guillaume d'Angleterre*, ll. 3364–66). As to Crestien's reference to the English monastery, Foerster is of the opinion that it is "eine ganz allgemeine: da der Held ein König von England sein soll, so verweist er die Zweifler an das englische Königsarchiv, genau so wie ein Spielmann in einem karolingischen Heldengedicht seine Zuhörer auf die Chroniken von St. Denis verweist."¹ In regard to Rogier, Gröber supposed him to be the poet Rogier de Lisais.² Crestien's statement, however, could be taken literally, and Rogier may have been a wandering clerk, an inmate of St. Edmund's Abbey itself, for the following reasons:

In 1182³ there was living at St. Edmund's Abbey a monk by the name of Rogerus de Hingham, or Hengheham, who was acting in the capacity of *cellarius*. Toward 1159–1162⁴ this Rogerus went to Rome in company of Samson, the future abbot. About 1160–61, or rather as Arnold thinks toward 1170,⁵ Rogerus together with Samson, Dionisius, and Hugo are said to have been sent into exile to the priory of Castle Acre, founded by William de Warenne, first Earl of Surrey.

In view of these facts, either of two suggestions may be made: first, Rogerus, a Bury monk, on his way to Rome may have traveled through Flanders and stopped at the court of Thierri, or of Matthew, or of Philip, where he could have met the author of *Yvain* and acquainted the latter with St. Edmund's Abbey, the *estoire*, and with English place-names; second, in consideration of the fact that the House of Flanders was related to the Warennes,⁶ Crestien may have

¹ Cf. Christian von Troyes Werke, *Wilhelmsleben*, IV, clxx.

² Cf. Grundriss, II, 524; W. Foerster, *Wilhelm von England*, pp. xxiv–xxv, Romanische Bibliothek, 1911.

³ Cf. *Memorials*, I, 223 ff., 212, 254.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 254 and xliii.

⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 212 and xliv and note.

⁶ Mary, Abbess of Romsey, a sister of Earl William of Warenne, last surviving son of King Stephen of Blois, married Matthew d'Alsace, younger brother of Thierri, Count

followed some prince connected with the Warennes over to England and resided for some time at Castle Acre where he came in contact with Rogerus then in exile. However this may be, the probable presence in Flanders or Champagne of Rogerus, a clerk of St. Edmund's Abbey at the time when *Guillaume d'Angleterre* was presumably written, is certainly significant.

St. Edmund's Abbey was above all a place where people went on pilgrimage. To mention only the frequent royal visits: in 1157, Henry II was crowned at Bury St. Edmund, the same king went there again in 1177, and also in 1188.¹ King John visited Bury in 1199, shortly after his coronation, and, says Jocelin,² *Hospitium suscepit, magnis celebratum expensis.* King John paid other visits in 1201 and in 1203.³ In fact, the foundation and the subsequent growth of St. Edmund's Bury were mostly due to the generosity of English kings: Edmund, Canute, Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror, and Stephen.⁴

Under such circumstances, close relations must have existed between the English kings and the Abbey, and the inmates of the convent may have been intimately connected at some time with the court and may of course have been of the same nationality as the kings. For, as J. H. Ramsay remarks:⁵ "not only were all the upper classes of society essentially French, but their ranks were perpetually being recruited by foreigners imported from abroad. These people entered every chapter and convent, they filled the Episcopate, the Treasury, and the Bench, and found themselves completely at home there."

The latter statement is especially applicable, as it seems, to St. Edmund's Abbey. Some of the abbots who lived during the period that interests us are as follows: Baldwin (1065-98), the physician of Edward the Confessor, came from St. Denis, near Paris; Robert (1100), a son of Henry I's cousin, Hugh Lupus, was a monk of

of Flanders, and uncle of Philip, the protector of Crestien (cf. K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, I, 469; R. W. Eyton, *Court, Household, and Itinerary of King II*, p. 50 [London, 1878]).

¹ Cf. Eyton, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 213, 285.

² Cf. *Cronica, Memorials*, I, 314-15.

³ Cf. *Memorials, Annales Sancti Eadmundi*, II, 8, 12.

⁴ Cf. *Memorials*, I, vii, xxvi, xxviii; Wace, *R. de Rou*, III, 5563.

⁵ Cf. *The Angevin Empire* (London, 1903), Pref., p. vi.

St. Evroult, in Normandy; Albold (1114-19) had been a prior of St. Nicasius, at Meaux; Anselm (1121-48) was a nephew of Saint Anselm; Galfridus, in the *De infantia Sancti Eadmundi*, mentions that Ording, the next abbot (1148-56), was "attendant on the person of the king from boyhood." Arnold conjectures that the king referred to must have been Stephen of Blois.¹ Abbot Samson (1182-1211), whose life Thomas Carlyle retold so vividly in *Past and Present*, is said to have been confessor to King Henry II.² But the relations of the St. Edmund's monks and the kings of England are illustrated best in Jocelin's *Chronicles* and in the *Electio Hugonis*, both of which record the interference of Henry II, and later of King John, with the elections of Abbot Samson and of Abbot Hugh (1215).³

In 1193, when Richard I was in captivity in Germany, Abbot Samson visited the king and brought him many presents.⁴

That St. Edmund's Abbey was famous for its library, we have already learned from Crestien de Troyes. From Jocelin's interesting *Chronicles* it appears that the Latin classics were read by the monks. In Jocelin's work, along with frequent allusions to the Scriptures, there are quotations from Terence's *Phormio*, Horace's *Odes*, *Epodes*, *Ars poetica*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, *Tristia*, *Ars amatoria*, *Heroïdes*, Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, and Cicero's *Tusculanae disputationes*. Needy clerks or scholars were also welcomed by Abbot Samson and found a pleasant home at the Benedictine Abbey.⁵

The authorship of *La vie Seint Edmunt* is claimed by Denis Piramus in two passages in his poem (ll. 16, 3279). Denis Piramus was at one time regarded as the author of the important romance *Partonopeus de Blois*,⁶ but it was shown long ago that this was an error due to a misinterpretation.⁷ Furthermore, a comparison of the language of *La vie Seint Edmunt* with that of *Partonopeus* would show that *La vie Seint Edmunt* and *Partonopeus* could not have been

¹ Cf. *Memorials*, I, xxx, xxxvi, xxxvii; 93, xxxv.

² Cf. Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 1846), III, 104.

³ Cf. *Memorials*, I, 223-29; II, 29 ff.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 259.

⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 209 ff., 247-49.

⁶ Ward, *op. cit.*, I, 700 ff., gives a list of scholars who had adopted this view.

⁷ Cf. G. Paris, *Romania*, IV, 148; Ward, *op. cit.*, I, 700 ff.; Paul Meyer, *Hist. litt. de la France*, XXXIII, 346, note.

written by the same author. Of Denis' other poems alluded to in ll. 5 and 7, none, so far as we know, have come down to us. All that is now known about Denis Piramus is found in the prologue of his poem (ll. 1-94), and in another prologue to the second part which apparently was left unfinished (ll. 3261-86). These two interesting prologues are re-edited here:

I (ll. 1-94)

Mult ai usé cume pechiere	Si dist bien de cele matire
Ma vie en trop fole maniere,	Cume de fable e de menceunge;
E trop [par] ai usé ma vie	30 La matire ressemble sunge,
[E] en pechié e en folie.	Kar ceo ne pout unkes [mais] estre;
5 Kant curt hanteie of les curteis,	Si est il tenu pur bon mestre,
Si feseie les servanteis,	E les vers [en] sunt mult amez
Chanceunettes, rimes, saluz	E en cez riches curz loëz.
Entre les drues e les druz;	35 E Dame Marie altresi
Mult me penai de tels vers fere,	Ki en rime fist e basti
10 K'assemble les peüsse trere	E compassa les vers de lais
E k'ensemble fussent justez	Ke ne sunt pas de tut verais;
Pur acomplir lur volentez.	E si en est el mult loëe
Ceo me fist fere l'enemi,	40 E la rime par tut amée,
Si me tinc ore a malbaili.	Kar mult l'aiment, si l'unt mult chier
15 Jamés ne me burdera plus.	Cunte, barun e chevalier;
Jeo ai nun Denis Piramus;	E si en aiment mult l'escrit,
Les jurs jolis de ma joenesce	E lirel funt, si unt delit,
S'en vunt, si trei jeo a veilesce;	45 E si le funt sovent retreire.
Si est bien dreit ke me repente;	Les lais suelent as dames pleire;
20 En autre ovre mettrai m'entente	Les oient de joie e de gré,
Ke mult mieldre est e plus nu-	Qu'il sunt sulum lur volenté.
table.	Li rei, li prince e li curtur,
[Si] Deus m'ait espiritable,	50 Cunte, barun e vavassur
E la grace Saint Esprit	Aiment cuntes, chanceuns e
Seit ovek mei e si [m'] ait!	fables
25 Cil ki <i>Partonopé</i> trova	E bons diz qui sunt delitables,
E ki les vers fist e rima,	
[Forment] se pena de bien dire;	

MS 1 cum, pechere; 2 manere; 4 peche; 5 courte, hantey; 6 fesei; 7 chanceunettes; 9 teles; 10 puise, treire; 13 fit; 14 tynt; 15 burderay; 16 noun; 17 jolifs, joefnesce; 20 metterai; 22 Dieus, me ayde; 24 of, moy; 27 mult; 28 il; 29 cum, menteonge; 30 ressemble, suonge; 31 put; 34 ces, curtes; 35 autresi; 37 compensa (see *List of Words*); 39 ele; 41 cher; 42 cunt, chivaler; 44 lire le; 45 les; 46 soleient; 47 De joye les oyent; 49 courtur; 50 cunt, vavasur; 52 bon, dilitables;

55 Kar il ostent e getent puer
 Doel, enui e travail de quer,
 E si funt ires ublier
 E del quer ostent le penser.
 Kant cil e vus, segnur trestuit,
 Amez tel ovre e tel deduit,
 Si vus volez entendre a mei,
 60 Jeo vus dirai par dreite fei
 Un deduit qui mielz valt asez
 Ke cez altres ke tant amez,
 E plus delitable a oir;
 Si purrez les almes garir
 65 E les cors garantir de hunte.
 Mult deit hom bien oir tel cunte;
 Hom deit mult mielz a sen entendre
 K'en folie le tens despendre.
 Un deduit par vers vus dirai
 70 Ke sunt de sen e si verai
 K'unkes rien ne pout plus veir
 estre,
 Kar bien le virent nostre an-
 cestre,
 E nus en apres d'eir en eir

75 Avum bien veü que c'est veir,
 Kar a noz tens est avenu
 De ceste oeuvre meinte vertu.
 Ceo que hom veit, ceo deit hom
 creire,
 Kar ceo n'est pas sunge n'arveire.
 Les vers que vus dirai si sunt

80 Des enfances de Seint Edmundt
 E des miracles altres;
 Unkes hom plus beals n'[en] oï.
 Rei, duc, prince e empereür,
 Cunte, barun e vavassur

85 Deivent bien a ceste oeuvre entendre,
 Kar bon ensample i purrunt prendre.
 Reis deit bien oir d'autre rei
 E l'ensample tenir a sei,
 E duc de duc e quens de cunte,

90 Kant la reisun a bien amunte.
 Les bones genz deivent amer
 D'oir retreire e recunter
 Des bones gestes les estoires
 E retenir en lur memoires.

II (ll. 3261-86)

Translaté avum l'aventure,
 Solum le livre e l'escriture,
 De Seint Edmund, coment il
 vint
 En Engleterre que il tint,
 3265 Dunt rei fu tant cum il vesqui,
 E del martire qu'il sufri.
 Translaté l'ai desqu'a la fin
 E de l'ngleis e del latin

Qu'en franceis le puissent entendre
 3270 li grant, [li meien] e li mendre.
 Uncor volum avant aler
 E les granz miracles cunter
 Que nostre sire Jhesu Crist
 Pur sue amur mustra e fist.

3275 Dit en ai [une] grant partie
 En sun martire e en sa vie,

53 hostent, gettent, penser; 54 travaile; 56 hostent; 60 dreit; 61 milez; 62 ces, autres; 65 garaunter; 66 homme; 67 homme; 69 dedut, dirray; 70 verray; 73 de eyr; 74 ceo est; 75 nos, aveneu; 76 cestre, verteu; 77 crere; 78 ne arveire; 79 dirray; 80 enfantes; 81 de, autres; 82 homme, ne oy; 83 emperur; 84 cunt, vavasur; 86 il purrunt; 87 rei, de autre; 91 bons; 92 de oir; 93 bons gestes e les estoires; 94 e retenir e lur.

MS 3264 Engletere; 3265 vesquit; 3266 martir, suffrit; 3267 desque; 3269 que en, poent; 3270 E li grant e li mendre (6 syll.); 3271 uncore; 3274 s'amur (7 syll.);

Meis ore vus dirai la sume;	Ke jeo resnablement la face,
Nel tinc pas a fais n'a grant sume.	E gré me sache de ma peine
Denis Piramus kil translate	E Deus e Saint Edmund de-
3280 Nel tient pas a fais n'a barate. 3285 E de l'eglise li segnur	meine
Li Seint Esprit me [dunt grace]	Ki m'unt enchargié cest labur!

3277 dirrai, summe; 3278 tint, ne a, summe; 3279 ad translate; 3280 ne a baratte; 3281 me seit grante; 3282 renablement; 3283 sace; 3284 Dieus; 3286 me unt.

The name Piramus coming from the classical story of *Piramus and Thisbe* already occurs in Crestien de Troyes, *Lancelot* 3821; otherwise this name is unusual. It appears also, however, in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum* (IX, 8), where we are told about a "Piramus capellanus," Arthur's chaplain; Wace (*Brut* 9842) reproduces it as Pyram. It is found also as Pyrannus in Matthew of Westminster, as Pyramos in the Pseudo-Gildas.¹ Piramus may possibly be a variant of Piranus: St. Piranus, in turn, seems to be identical with the Irish saint, Kiranus.² We also find mention of a "Hugo Piramus and Idonia his wife," as Ward pointed out, in the *Rotuli curiae regis* for 1199-1200.³ It is, therefore, evident that Piramus with the Latin ending was used as a family name.⁴

Was Denis Piramus a courtier, a good knight, and a clever versifier of light songs who repented in his later years? Was he a clerk serving at court in the capacity of tutor or chaplain to some noble man or noble lady? Did he later withdraw from the court, possibly at the time of Henry II's troubles with Becket, and take refuge in St. Edmund's Abbey? Was he a wandering *trouwère* who finally stranded at St. Edmund's and was given a lodging there?

Judging from the contents of his *Vie Seint Edmunt*, Denis Piramus appears to have been a man of attainments. Not to mention his literary activities at court and his familiarity with Marie's *Lais* and with *Partonopeus de Blois*, Denis was conversant with Latin

¹ Cf. Gottfried von Monmouth, *Hist. Reg. Brit.*, ed. San Marte, Halle, 1854, p. 379, note.

² Cf. *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*, *Dict. of Nat. Biogr.*, and San Marte, *op. cit.*, p. 379, note.

³ Cf. *Catalogue of Romances*, I, 704; *Record Commission*, II, 146.

⁴ Cf. The *Rotuli Scaccarii Normanniae*, ed. Th. Stapleton, London, 1844, and other Rolls of that time, show such names as Eudo Ruffus, Ricardus Canutus, Robertus Balduinus, etc. Cf. also Hugh Lupus, Duffus, etc.

and English (cf. l. 3268). His enthusiastic eulogy of *la clergie* (cf. ll. 1581-88) and his use of words such as *besorder*, *tresvasez* (cf. *List of Words*) may also point to a clerk.

Denis claims (l. 3285) that *li segnur de l'eglise* engaged him to write his work. The *eglise* referred to is evidently St. Edmund's Abbey. There he could most readily obtain the necessary data concerning St. Edmund's life. Jocelin¹ speaks of it in the same terms—*ecclesia Sancti Eadmundi*. “*Li segnur*” (*Domini ecclesiae*) were apparently the abbot, the prior, and the sub-prior, in short, the heads of the abbey.

The poem was apparently intended to be read or recited (cf. *ore oëz*, *Cristiene gent* 95, and so ll. 3074, 60, 79, 126, 3320, etc.) to an audience of nobles (cf. ll. 49-65). It was translated from the English and Latin:

Qu'en franceis le puissent entendre
Li grant, [li meien] e li mendre.

The intention of the *segnurs* is obvious: the translation may be said to have been ordered with a view to acquaint the Norman, Angevin, or Poitevin nobles with an English saint and martyr's life and deeds. The Abbey had become a well-known place of pilgrimage and was accustomed to receive guests of note. Was the *Life* written and read on the occasion of the visit of a particular prince? This is not impossible. A reading in the royal guests' language on St. Edmund's life would appear to be a most appropriate entertainment: it would advertise the abbey and prompt the French-speaking listeners to make valuable gifts.

To obtain further data about Denis, we should naturally examine closely the collected “Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey.” But as Arnold remarked,² “the history of the community, and of any remarkable men who may have arisen in it from age to age is less easily ascertained”; and, further, “we rarely obtain any insight into the characters of the individual men who carried on the work from generation to generation.” Yet it has escaped notice that mention is made of a certain “Magister Dionisius” in Jocelin's *Chronicles*,³ where events are recorded which took place in the Abbey between 1173 and 1202, in the time of Abbots Hugh and Samson.

¹ Cf. *Memorials*, I, 209.

² Cf. *ibid.*, I, vi.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 209-336.

The omission of the surname "Piramus" need not surprise us. In Jocelin's *Chronicles*, the monks are usually mentioned by their first names only, for instance: Ricardus, Jocelinus, Robertus. This Magister Dionisius rose to such importance as to become a rival of Magister Samson at the time of the election of a new abbot, in 1182. He is spoken of on several occasions:

About 1173, during Abbot Hugh's time, Dionisius is said to have just returned from banishment—possibly from the priory of Castle Acre, a Cluniac institution, if my interpretation of Samson's speech be right—where he had been sent, along with Samson and others, because, as Samson is reported to have said, "locuti sumus pro communi bono ecclesiae nostrae contra voluntatem abbatis."¹

In 1176 Dionisius performed the office of "cellerarius" and he is said to have reduced the convent debt "per providentiam suam et cautelam."²

In 1182 Dionisius was one of twelve monks who appeared before Henry II at Waltham for the purpose of electing a new abbot. At the king's order, the monks nominated three candidates. Samson was one of these, but as the king did not know any of the three, he bade them nominate three others, and so the nomination of Dionisius ensued. Later on, Samson and the prior were left as the only suitable nominees. Dionisius, acting as spokesman for all the deputies, commended both of them, but "semper in angulo sui sermonis Samsonem protulit," whereupon Samson was elected.³

The last mention of Dionisius appears in 1200. Here he is plainly opposed to Abbot Samson's misdeeds. It is recorded that Samson had sold a certain office to one of his own servants, and to quote Jocelin's words: "Unde et magistro Dionisio monacho dicenti, tale factum inauditum esse, respondit abbas, 'Non desinam facere voluntatem meam magis pro te, quam pro juvencello illo.'"⁴ There is also a further mention of Magister Dionisius as appearing before the Curia regis in 1191.⁵

It seems permissible to identify Dionisius of the *Chronicles* with Denis Piramus of *La vie Seint Edmunt* for the following reasons:

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 212.

² Cf. *ibid.*, I, 223-29.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 213.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 327-28.

⁵ Cf. "Pedes Finium," *Publications of the Pipe Roll Society* (London, 1894), XVII, 10.

1. The dates offer no objection. Denis may have left the Court and have entered St. Edmund's Abbey when Henry II had troubles with the church and Becket, in or about 1170.

2. In the *Chronicles*, Dionisius is mentioned as "Magister" and "Monachus," while in *La vie Seint Edmunt*, Denis Piramus appears to have been a court poet in his youth, and, later, a clerk and a scholar who wrote his poem at the request of the heads of the abbey.

3. In 1200, Dionisius must have been an elderly person, and Samson's reply leads one to make the same inference, since Dionisius is contrasted with a "juvencellus." In *La vie Seint Edmunt*, Denis Piramus tells us:

Les jurs jolis de ma joenesce
S'en vunt, si trei jeo a veilesce.

4. Dionisius and Denis Piramus stand out as upright, worthy persons. If, at the time of Abbot Samson's election, the proceedings at court were carried on in French, Dionisius may have been chosen as spokesman by his fellow-monks on account of his fluency in French, and because of his self-confidence, acquired during his stay at court.

5. It is also possible to admit that because of the friction which arose between him and Abbot Samson in or before 1200, Dionisius, if he be the same person as Denis Piramus, lost interest in his work, and, contrary to the desire of his *segnurs*, left unfinished the second part of his poem.

After 1200 no more is heard of Dionisius. In a list which mentions all the monks—62 in all—who stood for or against the election of Abbot Hugo, in 1214, the name Dionisius does not appear.¹ It may, therefore, be conjectured that Magister Dionisius either left the abbey or, what is more probable, died before 1214.

In the prologue we are told something about the author's stay at court and about his writing love-songs for the nobles. Apparently the court Denis refers to was that of Henry II and Aliénor; it is less likely that he refers to some baronial house of the period.

The *genres* of poetry which Denis claims to have written are worth examining. They plainly denote a Provençal origin or influence, and, considering the social relations between Anjou and

¹ Cf. *Memorials, Electio Hugonis*, II, 75-76.

Aquitaine, these poems are such as one might expect to find at the court of Anjou.

According to Gröber¹ *serventeis*, *chansonetes* (*rimes*), et *saluz* are supposed to mean "lyrische Texte von höfischer Art." The *serventeis*, to quote P. Meyer² "paraît désigner d'abord des poésies d'agrément, non pas, comme plus tard, des chansons religieuses. Comme en provençal, on a appliqué cette dénomination à des chansons ayant un caractère politique." "Poésie d'agrément" is evidently what *serventeis* means to Denis. It is found with this meaning as early as Wace and as late as Eustache Deschamps, who leaves out the *serventeis* in his *Art de dictier*,³ "pour ce que c'est ouvrage qui se porte aux puis d'amours et que nobles hommes n'ont pas acoustumé de ce faire." As regards the origin of the *serventeis*, P. Meyer remarks that "le mot a dû être créé dans le Midi," and further adds, "s'il en est ainsi, le mot *serventeis* serait l'un des plus anciens exemples de l'influence de la poésie des troubadours sur celle des trouvères." To write *serventeis*, as it seems, was a common thing early in the West, and Wace's verses justify this view:

Mais or puis je lunges penser,
Livres escrire e translater,
Faire rumanz e serventeis.

—*R. de Rou*, III, ll. 151-53.

Similarly in *R. de Rou*, II, l. 4148. As is known, Richard Cœur de Lion, the son of Aliénor, composed some.⁴ Denis Piramus appears to have been one of the first western writers to mention these lyrical poems.

The *Salut*, or *Salut d'amour*, is defined by Raynouard⁵ as "une pièce qui commençait par une salutation à la dame dont le poète faisait l'éloge." This genre is common to both French and Provençal literatures, but, as P. Meyer thinks,⁶ it is unknown elsewhere, and, to quote his words, "je doute même qu'il ait été fréquent en Angleterre." He adds in a note, "le seul texte anglo-normand que

¹ Cf. *Grundriss*, II, 661.

² Cf. *Romania*, XIX, 28, 29.

³ Cf. *Oeuvres*, p. p. G. Raynaud, VII, 281.

⁴ Cf. *Grundriss*, II, 661, 675.

⁵ Cf. *Poésies des troubadours*, II, 258.

⁶ Cf. *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 6^e série, III (1867), p. 124.

j'aie rencontré sur les Saluts est d'un poète du XIII^e siècle, Denis Piramus." The *Salut* appeared first in Provençal in the twelfth century (before Rambaud d'Orange), and in French poetry a century later.¹

In Provençal, the *chansonette*² appears with the first troubadour poet, William IX, Count of Poitiers, and later with Peirol, Raimon de Miraval.³ In French, mention of it is made by Crestien de Troyes:

Aussi con maint home divers
Pueent ou chancenete ou vers
Chanter a une concordance.

—*Cligés*, ll. 2843-45.

We have *chansonettes* composed by Guiot de Provins, a protégé of William V, Count of Mâcon, by an anonymous author, and later by Raoul de Soissons, a friend of King Thiébaut of Navarre,⁴ etc.

According to F. Wolf, *rime* appears to denote the octosyllabic riming couplet, and he thinks, "es scheint dass sie [the *trouvères*] durch *rime* vorzugsweise diese kurzen höfischen Reimpaare und die in dieser Form abgefassten Gedichte überhaupt bezeichnet haben."⁵ Wolf admits that *rimes* in our poem is represented "als eine eigene besondere [Form]," but he adds "worunter wohl nur die höfischen Reimpaare zu verstehen sind." Yet *rimes* may have here a technical meaning and may refer to a special genre of love-song or light poem. The following instances would tend to support such a contention:

J'ai fait fabliaus et contes, rimes et servantois
Pour desduire la gent environ cui j'estois.

—*Chastie Musart*, I, A. Tobler, *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.*, IX, 329.

Et les leçons que chanter on y ose,
Ce sont rondeaulx, ballades, virelais,
Motz a plaisir, rithmes et triolletz,
Lesquelz Venus apprend a retenir
A un grand tas d'amoureux nouvelletz.

—C. Marot, *Le temple de Cupido*, 327-31;
Oeuvres, ed. G. Guiffrey, II, 89.

¹ Cf. P. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 138, 127.

² Cf. Diez, *Poesie der Troubadours*, pp. 110, 251; Raynouard, *Poésies des troubadours*, II, 169.

³ Cf. Raynouard, *op. cit.*, III, 1; V, 284, 287; II, 164, 169.

⁴ Cf. *Hist. litt. de la France*, XXIII, 611; W. Wackernagel, *Altfranzös. Lieder und Leiche*, pp. 25, 9; Mätzner, *Altfranzös. Lieder*, pp. 20, 163.

⁵ Cf. *Über die Lais*, pp. 177-81, 162, 16.

In Provençal, *rim*, *rima*, and *rimeta* have the meaning of "poème," "petit poème." *Rimeta* occurs as early as Rambaud d'Orange:

En aital rimeta prima
M'agradon leu mot e prim.

—Raynouard, *Lex. roman.*

In Spanish and Italian, as is known, *rima*, pl. *rimas*, *rime*, may refer to a metrical composition.

Our author's testimony as to the popularity of *Partonopeus de Blois* and of Marie's *Lais* corroborates the assumption that Henry II's court is the one referred to here. It was no doubt in courtly circles that Denis obtained his familiarity with the works of his contemporaries. As regards Marie de France, we know now with a high degree of probability in what relations she stood to Henry II and the royal family,¹ and we may suppose that her *Lais* were in vogue during the latter part of her half-brother's reign. Was Denis a fellow-poet in the royal circles where his more gifted rivals were outshining him in wit and genius? It is not impossible, for we find that when Denis is writing *La vie Seint Edmunt*, it is with a bit of spite mingled with regret that he looks upon the success of *Dame Marie* (cf. ll. 39-40), and of him *qui Partonopé trova* (cf. ll. 32-34).

Is there anything outside of the language which would tend to show that Denis Piramus had sojourned in France?

Evidently *La vie Seint Edmunt* was composed in England, yet it seems highly probable that the author must have lived on the Continent at some time for the following reasons:

1. His acquaintance with four types of love-songs of Provençal origin would be rather remarkable otherwise.
2. His knowledge of nautical terms and his delight in dwelling on the details of sea voyages indicate that he may have crossed the Channel more than once.
3. Another remark, of more doubtful value, may also be made. Success in the lyric poetry of a cultured and literary society presupposes on the part of the poet a familiarity with the *nuances* of the language, and also possibly the same dialectical pronunciation as the audience he is addressing. Conon de Béthune records for us the taunts he had to endure at the court of Philippe Auguste's mother.

¹ Cf. J. C. Fox, *English Historical Review*, XXV (1910), 303-6; XXVI (1911), 317-26; E. Faral, *Romania*, XXXIX, 625.

It is not too much to claim that only a young poet born of Norman or Angevin parents, whether in France or in England, would have met such requirements as these.

La vie Seint Edmunt has always been considered an Anglo-Norman poem.¹ The presence of the following traits supports this view: (1) silencing of pretonic *e* in hiatus; see below, § 71; (2) non-agreement of the predicate adjective and participle, §§ 40-43; (3) substitution of the object for the subject not in the predicate, §§ 40-43; (4) reduction of *ie* to *e*, § 12; (5) use of *que* for *qui*, § 53.

Some reservations should be made for (1) and (4). As for (2) and (3), they are also found in continental writers. Here follows a summary of other linguistic traits shown by our text: (6) separation of *o* and *u*, § 8; (7) separation of *o* from checked open *ð*, § 7, § 8; (8) confusion of *o* < checked *ð* (ð) and *ou* < free *ð* (ð) and *ð* (ð)+*u*, § 8; (9) *ue* < short *ð* rimes only with itself, § 16; (10) *ð+I* becomes *ui:nuit*, § 17; (11) no reduction of *ui* to *u* or *i*, § 17; (12) *ð+I* becomes *i:delit*, § 6; (13) *iēr* < *-ider* rimes with *ē* only: *afēr:jurer* 878, § 12; (14) after *i*, *ē* < Latin tonic *A* becomes *ie:otreiier*, § 12; (15) separation of infinitives in *eir* < *ERE* from those in *ēr* < *ARE*, § 10, § 55; (16) separation of *ei* from *ai*, save in *vait:dreit*, § 9, § 10; (17) *ai* rimes with *e* in the groups *-aistre -ait -ais* only, § 9; (18) separation of *ē* < checked *Ē* (Ē) from *ē* < checked *Ē* (Ē) save before nasals, § 2 § 3; (19) separation of *ē* from *ē* and *e*, § 4; (20) separation of *an* from *en*, § 18; (21) confusion of *ain* and *ein*, but not before *ñ*, § 22; (22) *iēn* rimes with *iēn*, § 23; (23) *uen* rimes with *en*, § 25; (24) separation of final *-z* and *-s*, § 30; (25) no conclusive instance to show that *s* has become silent before *t*, § 30; (26) no confusion of *n* and *ñ*, § 27; (27) disappearance of *l* in *ūl+con.*, *l'* in *il'+con.*; no evidence as to other groups, § 26; (28) no *e* in the ind. pres. I of conj. I, § 54; (29) no *e* in the subj. pres. 3 of conj. I, § 57; (30) endings *iūm*, *iēz* of the impf. and cond. are dissyllabic, § 54; (31) save in two doubtful cases, impfs. of conj. I. do not mix with those of other conj., § 58; (32) preterite III in *-iē*, § 59; (33) subj. pres. in *-ge*, § 57; (34) enclitic use of the pronoun *le* after a verb, § 70.

¹ Cf. G. Paris, *La litt. franc. au M.-A.* (1905), § 148; Suchier, *St.-Auban*, p. 3; Vising, *Étude*, pp. 16-62; Menger, *The Anglo-Norman Dialect*, p. 43.

The foregoing summary shows that, upon the whole, the language of Denis Piramus does not differ essentially from that of western continental poets. The phonology of our author, if it be compared with that of Anglo-Norman writers between approximately 1170 and 1210, as for instance Adgar, Fantosme, Simund de Freine, Chardri, stands out as remarkably pure.

I. In many respects Denis' language is similar to that of Marie de France. The following traits are also represented in her works: (2), (3), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), (22), (24), (25), (26), (27),¹ (28), (29), (30), (31).

II. Some traits appear in Benoît de Sainte-Maure: (2), (3), (4), (23), (32), (33), (34).

III. Guillaume le Clerc shows no reduction of *ui* to *i*, (11).

IV. *Partonopeus de Blois* shows the confusion of *ai* and *ei*, (16).

Considering the purity of Denis' phonology, which led Suchier to include *La vie Seint Edmunt* in the first Anglo-Norman period, considering also the facts which have been brought out with reference to the life of the author, it may be justifiable to conjecture that Denis Piramus, like Frère Angier, was a continental who went to England in his youth. In England he may have acquired the Anglo-Norman traits found in his language (the silencing of pretonic *e* in hiatus, and the use of *que* for *qui*), or he may have preserved native characteristics which possibly became more marked during his stay on English soil (the reduction of *ie* to *e* and the disorganization of the case-flexion). We have a similar instance in Marie de France, whose language (I refer to the *Espurgatoire Saint Patriz*) shows to what extent the poet of the *Lais* fell under the influence of the Anglo-Norman environment.

The attempt to determine Denis' dialect thus offers some difficulties, and may appear idle. Yet another suggestion may be made: as the language of our author agrees in many respects with that of Marie de France, it may be supposed that Denis Piramus came from the same region as Marie. If the latter be the same person as the Abbess of Shaftesbury, she was probably born in Maine, as her half-brother Henry II was. Hence, in such a case, Denis Piramus would

¹ In Marie, *l'* has disappeared in *il' + cons.*, and *l* is vocalized in *sous < sōlus, genus < *GENŪCULOS*. There is no evidence as to other groups.

come from Maine. Other traits, which have been indicated above, found also in southwestern authors, would tend to corroborate this view.

However tempting this conjecture may be, it must be borne in mind that in the case of *La vie Seint Edmunt* we may have to deal with a literary language used skilfully by an Anglo-Norman writer and that further data on the author's life and origin are not yet available. Consequently, for the present, we do not feel warranted in excluding *La vie Seint Edmunt* from the Anglo-Norman dialect.

Save Suchier, who classes it with the earliest Anglo-Norman monuments, that is, in the first period (till after 1150), scholars agree in dating *La vie Seint Edmunt* after 1180.¹

If what has been said with reference to the life of the author and to the contents of the poem be taken into consideration, namely, (1) that Denis Piramus may be identified with Magister Dionisius of Jocelin's *Chronicles*, whose presence in the monastery from 1173 to 1200 is recorded and who probably died before 1214; (2) that some years must have elapsed for Marie's *Lais* to gain their vogue (the composition of Marie's poems referred to in the *Life* is set by Warnke at not before 1165, by Suchier between 1160 and 1170, and by G. Paris as late as 1180), it may be assumed that *La vie Seint Edmunt* could hardly have been written before 1175, or, if we accept G. Paris' dating of the *Lais*, before 1190.

LANGUAGE OF DENIS PIRAMUS

VOWELS

§ 1. *A*.—Both *al* and *el* from the Latin suffix *-ALIS* appear in our poem: *real: hospital* 627: *estal* 731, *seneschal: leal* 1725 but *hostel: espiritel* 2855. The MS shows *tel*, *quel* regularly.

§ 2. *E*.—French open *e* does not rhyme with short *ɛ*, or with long *ɛ̄*: *tere: conquere* 207: *guere* 1424, *estre: ancestre* 71, *teste: beste* 2751, *batel: damisel* 1385, *apres: ades* 3507, *descovert: apert* 3967, *est: est* (East) 119. Out of 72 rimes, 65 are pure and 7 are mixed with *ai*; cf. § 9.

§ 3. *Ȑ* rimes only with itself: *chapelete: petite* 2829, *joefnesce: veilesce* 17, *tramettent: demettent* 257, *conqueste: ceste* 1987, *prest: conquest* 277, *merveil:*

¹ Cf. *Ueber die "Vie de Seint Auban,"* p. 3; G. Paris, *Romania*, VIII, 38; *Litt. frang. au. M.A.* (1905), § 148; Gröber, *Grundriss*, II, 646-47; P. Meyer, *Hist. litt. de la France*, XXXIII, 346; Th. Arnold, *Memorials*, II, 137; Mrs. Ravenel, *La vie Seint Edmund*, p. 53; Voretzsch, *Studium der Altfr. Lit.*, p. 147.

conseil 937. *ɛ* is found once riming with *ai<ə+ɪ fet:net<NITIDUM* 661. This confusion occurs in incorrect lines, and it may be questioned whether it belongs to the author.

§ 4. *Ē*.—Save in a few instances where it rimes with *ie* (see § 12), *ē* is not mixed in rime with any other sound: 33, 39, 47, 61, 91, 541, 1451, 2855, etc. The imperfect of *estre, ert* and *erent* as usual have *ē*: *erent:doterent* 197, *ert:pert<PARET* 2548. By the side of the usual *e*, this sound is represented by *ee*: *neefes* 179, *deleez* 3548; by *ei*: *sueif* 1522, *neis* 1943, *melleies* 3755, *espeies* 3756; by *ie*: *nief* 1067, *clier* 3029, *deliez* 1505, *martelier* 3143; by *i*: *til* 656, *estroyr*, 3763. The MS shows *miest<MANSTIT* 1569, *remist* 165, 2664, and *remistrent* 2462.

§ 5. *Atonic e*.—Before the tonic syllable: By the side of the regular spelling *e*, as in *chevalerie* 396, *chemin* 452, the following spellings are to be found: (1) *a:chāi* 390, *aparceurent* 2751, *orfanins* 1845; (2) *o:bosoigne* 1196, *poür* 2173, *roündes* 309; (3) *u:sulum* 48, *sujurner* 163, *sucurs* 2189; (4) *oi:boisoigne* 630; (5) *ie:sorcierie* 1934; (6) *i:chimin* 614, *gisir* 763, *chivals* 1054, *primier* 1674; (7) *ei:treissor* 912.

§ 6. *I* from various sources is found in rime only with itself: *vie:folie* 3, *pais:pis* 271, *pleisir:tenir* 523. Latin *ɛ+ɪ* rimes with *i:escriit:delit* 43:lit 1302. Latin *-ITIAM* and *-ITIUM* become *ise* (MS *ise, ice*): *eglise:justise* 463: *sacrifice* 2505: *servise* 3014. Latin *MAT̄RIAM* shows *matre:dire* 28 and *matere:artere* 2709 (cf. Suchier, *Voyelles toniques*, § 15a). The spellings *y, ei, ie* appear by the side of *i:ay* 1, *ayment* 51, etc., *chevalereie* 396, *fremierent*, 3612.

§ 7. *Q* from Latin *AU* and Latin checked *ō* rimes with itself only: *or:tresor* 537, *fort:mort* 667, *choses:encloses* 1785. As in most continental poems, *mot<MÜTTUM:clot* 743 appears with *o*,¹ it rimes with *out<HABUIT* 2337, cf. § 15.

In tonic or pretonic position the usual spelling for this sound is *o*. It also appears as *ou:ouré< AURATUM* 190, *ouwel* 296, *voult* 840, *vouer* 1006; as *u:ublier* 55, *murir* 875, etc.

§ 8. *Q* and *Ou*.—*o* from Latin checked *ō* (ū), *ou* from Latin free *ō* (ū), and Latin *ō* (ū)+*y* have become close *o* in our text and are found riming together: *jour:gaaignoir* 241, *estrus:enviūs* 1879, *estrus:vus* 727, *vus:andus* (MS *andeus*) 1085.

Here we may associate Denis with Marie (cf. *Fabeln*, pp. lxxxii, lxxxvi), Benoit (cf. *R. de Troie*, pp. 121, 122), *Partonopeus* (cf. *amor:yor* 21, *ros:angoissois* 1509, *ros:los<LÜPOS* 8535).

Q is not found in rime with any other sound. The rime *peresceuz* (*perecos*):*venuz* 3854 is very doubtful and ought probably to be discarded because *-s* and *-z* do not rime with one another. *Perceūz* may possibly be read instead of *peresceuz* (cf. *List of Words*).

In the MS the tonic syllable *o* in or out of rime is represented by *ue*: *surs:curs* 1531; by *ou*: *pastour:treitour* 2117; by *eu*: *andeus*, 1086, *piteus*:

¹ Cf. Walberg, *Bestiaire*, p. xlvi.

2447; by *o:laborent* 239, *proz* 3245. The spelling *u* is much the most common. In pretonic syllable it appears as *u*, *o*, and *ou*; *u* being more generally used than *o*.

§ 8. *U*.—The rimes in *u* from various sources are pure: 15, 75, 145, 587, 1209, etc. By the side of the usual spelling *u*, the MS shows twice *ui* (*uy*):*druy* 618, *murmuire* 1534; and sometimes *eu*:*aveneu*:*verteu* 75. The parasitic *e* in the latter spelling may arise by analogy to words which have an *e* etymologically.¹

§ 9. *Ai*.—The rimes in *ai* are mostly pure: *mais:fais*<*FASCEM* 143, *retreire:bon eire* 495, *enfrez:forfez* 1289. *Ai* in the groups *-aistre*, *-ait*, *-ais* rimes with *é* from Latin checked *é*: *mestre:estre* 32, *veit:set*<*SEPTEM* 3850, *mes:apres* 1576.

Here Denis may be associated with Marie de France (cf. *Fabeln*, p. lxxxiii), Benoit de Ste. Maure (cf. *R. de Troie*, VI, 114), *Partonopeus* (cf. *mestre:estre* 929, *forest:trest* 744, *no-ait* group, *pes:apres* 919, *baisse:presse* 7483).

Ai is found once in rime with *ei*: *vait* (MS *veit*):*dreit* 785, possibly also in Marie de France (*espleit:fait* *El.* 223:*estait ib.* 337), and in the *Life of St. Osith* (*vait:dreit* 899). These rimes are not necessarily to be discarded as incorrect.²

According to Suchier (*op. cit.*, § 30b) in Anglo-Norman “*ei*, surtout devant *s*, *r*, *d*, *t*, est passé à *ai* avant que l’ancien *ai* ne fut contracté en *e*.” With this fact in view, the presence of such rimes in Denis, Marie de France, and in the *Life of St. Osith* may be explained as being due to Anglo-Norman influence. On the other hand, these rimes may serve as evidence that the western or southwestern French dialect had an influence on the language of Denis and Marie.

The confusion of *ei* and *ai* is found frequently in *Partonopeus de Blois* (cf. *palais:deis* 4143: *queis* 5093: *maneis* 1847).³ For the rime *fait* (MS *set*):*net* 661; cf. § 3. As regards the spelling in rime-words, 42 appear with *ai*; 34 with *ei*; 31 with *e*; and 2 with *ie*; out of rime, in tonic or pretonic positions, *ei* is more frequently used than *ai* or *e*.

§ 10. *Ei*.—The rimes in *ei* are all pure: *rei:sei* 87, *dreit:esteit* 641, *anceis:reis* 1127, *aver:saver* 1645, *creire:arveire* 77, *veie:desreie* 319.

Ai+l' and *ei+l'* are kept separate: *soleil:vermeil* 1171: *conseil* 1266, *asaile:bataile* 1617, *vilanaile:rascaille* 2161. For the rime *veit:dreit* 785; cf. § 9. Excepting a few instances, *ei* is the usual spelling for this sound; *e* appears occasionally. To be noted are: *lay:fay* 2677, *fiz* 1683, *moy* 24, 542, *consail:mervail* 938:*solail* 1265.

¹ Cf. Stimming, *Boeve de Haumont*, p. 180.

² Cf. Warnke, *Fabeln*, p. lxxxiv; A. T. Baker, *Mod. Lang. Review* (1912), VII, 81.

³ Cf. T. A. Jenkins, *Modern Philology* (1913), X, 448, who claims that *Partonopeus de Blois* “from trustworthy indications, belongs in the Loire valley, possibly in the region of the Sarthe.”

§ 11. *Eu*.—Latin *DEÙS* appears as *Dieus* in the MS. This spelling is to be ascribed to the copyist. The only rime where this word occurs indicates that *eu* is to be expected for the author: *Deu:Eliseu<ELISEUM 3191*.

§ 12. *Ie*.—The rimes in *ie* are for the most part pure. Out of the 4032 lines of *La vie Seint Edmunt*, there are 323 rimes in *ē*, 129 in *ie*, and 4 in *ë* mixed with *ie*: *conseilier:gaimenter* 869, *justisier:mer* 1653, *enfundrer:drescier* 3133, *cessez:jugiez* 3189.

Of these four cases, *justisier* and *cessez* are not sure: *justisier* appears in a doubtful line, and it rimes elsewhere regularly with *-ier*: *mestier* 715, *dréturiers* 771; *cesser* rimes in the same poem regularly with *ē*: *demener* 3425, and *cessiez* may, therefore, stand for *laissiez*. Two other instances of confusion may be explained: *sazees* (*:cuntees*) 416 stands for *asazees* and is regular; *eslisez* (*:preisiez*) 1061, *Imperat* 5 (*-ez* through the influence of the preceding *i* may become *iez*) ought to be included in the list of words which rime now with *ie*, now with *ē*: cf. *conseillez* (*Imperat* 5): *eslisez* 3525 (*Vie de St. Gilles*), *eslisiez* 275, 877 (*Stengel, Roland*), and also *prisiez:despisiez* 3564 (*Erec et Enide*), *avillier* in *Marie de France* (cf. *Fabeln*, pp. lxxxiv-lxxxv). There are, therefore, apparently only two sure instances of mixed rimes. It is to be noted that in these two cases of confusion *ie* comes from Latin *a* by Bartsch's law, and to quote Miss Pope (*Étude*, p. 57), "dans les dialectes du Sud-Ouest et en partie du Nord-Ouest, la loi de Bartsch ne s'opère pas: *ie* et *e* se trouvent mêlés dans *l'Epître de Saint Etienne*, dans le *Sponsus*, dans le *Saint Martin* et dans l'orthographe des chartes de toute cette partie de la France." Suchier (cf. *op. cit.*, § 29e) states that rhymes of *ie* and *ē* were not avoided scrupulously by Benoît and adds: "ce qui pourrait s'expliquer par son origine méridionale (Touraine)." G. Paris (cf. *Vie de St. Gilles*, p. xxiv) also admits that the confusion of *ie* and *ē* is found, though rarely, in Norman texts of the twelfth century. In view of so small a proportion of mixed rimes, Jenkins thought (cf. *Modern Language Notes*, XXII, 195) that the exclusion of *La vie Seint Edmunt* from Suchier's first group could hardly be warranted. Our poem, however, must have been written at a later date.

—*iēr* from *-ider* rimes only with *ē*: *ubliēr:penser* 55, *afiēr:jurer* 878, *giēr:mer* 1344, *merciē:conquestē* 2974. In this particular rime Denis Piramus is to be classed with Wace, Marie de France, and Guillaume le Clerc.¹ It may be noted that instances of *-iēr* from *-ier* are already found in Benoît, Ambroise, and Garnier. For Simund de Freine (end of the twelfth century) *-iēr* in *fier* appears to count for one syllable.

After an *i*, *ē* from Latin tonie A becomes *ie*: *popliē:chaciē* 325, *chier:otrier* 1327, *liē:enragiē* 2373, *manier:entier* 3221. The same development is to be found in Marie de France. This sound is usually represented by *ie* and *e* in almost the same proportion; *ee*, *ei*, and *i* appear rarely: *greef* 158, *lee* 174; *breif* 689, *peiz* 1435; *milz* 3022.

¹ Cf. Warnke, *Fabeln*, p. lxxxiv; Suchier, *op. cit.*, § 17d.

§ 13. *Iu* (*ieu*).—Our text shows both *fié* and *fiu* in rime; *fiu:liu* 2915, *fié:leissié* 2850; and this associates Denis with the author of the *Roland*, *Marie*, *Garnier* and with the author of *Parlonopeus* (cf. *fiu:liu* 1718, *fié:congié* 1195). *Lius* < *LÖCUS* rimes with *pius* < *PIUS* 624. The MS shows for Latin *lÖCUM*, *jÖCUM*, *fÖCUM*: *liu* 1531, *geu* 563, *feu* 2126.

§ 14. *Qi* and *qi*.—In the few rimes found in our poem, the two sounds remain separate: *qi:picois:chois* < *KAUSJAN* 3145; in the learned words which have *q* for *qi*: *estoire:gloire* 2503, *glorie:vincie* 3861; *qi:croiz:voiz* 2393, 2448. The MS shows *conustre* for *conoistre* 589, 1929.

§ 15. *Qu*.—The endings *-out* (-ot) of the imp. of the I conj. and the pret. of the III conj. is found in rime mainly with itself. *Penout:pout* 499, *parlout:sujournout* 1145, *desplout:out* 831; the MS shows *sorent:orient* 1594: *parent* 2820. This sound rimes once with *q*: *mot:out* 2337. The same confusion appears also in *Marie de France*, *Raoul de Houdan*, *Garnier* (*Wolfenbüttel* MS), etc. and the author of *Parlonopeus de Blois* (cf. *mot:sot* < *SAPUIT* 187).

§ 16. *Ue*.—*Ue* from Latin free ð and free ð (ð) before *p*, is found in rime with itself only: *estuet:puet* 1333, *foer:quoer* 1941, *ovre:recovre* < *RECUPERAT* 2419, *broil:foil* 2697. *Penser:quer* 53 appears to be an incorrect rime due to the scribe.¹

The rime *resquens:tens* 3541 shows that ð+nasal had diphthongized. This sound is denoted by various spellings: by (1) *ue:estuet* 646, *puet* 2079; (2) *oe:estoeil* 1003, *poet* 865, *poeple* 704; (3) *o:trovent* 219, *ovre* 1232, *illoc* 2155; (4) *u:iluc* 345, *put* 651, *murt* 652; (5) *ou:voult* 2223; (6) *oe* and *oi* before *l*: *doel* 54, *oil* 2331, *soil* 2332; (7) *e: nef* 2060.

For Latin *cōr*, the MS shows *quer* 56, *quoer* 1942, *quor* 2284.

§ 17. *Ui*.—*Uei* from Latin ð+I is reduced to *ui* and rimes regularly with *ui* from other sources. All the rimes in *ui* are pure: *lui:ennui* 1391: *fui:1696:ambedui* 3444, *deduit* < *DÜCTUM* with û of *DÜCO:trestuit* 58: *nuit* 1400, *tuit:nuit* 3307.

By the side of the usual spelling *ui*, *u* and *i* also appear. There is no evidence in rime-words of reduction of *ui* to *u* or to *i* as we find in *Wace*, *Benoit*, *Marie*. *Guillaume le Clerc* does not show any instance of reduction of *ui* to *i* and here we may class Denis with him.

HENRY E. HAXO

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

[To be concluded]

¹ *Penser* is to be replaced by *puer*, for (1) the line is too long by one syllable, and (2) *puer* makes better sense; *geter puer* is a common O. Fr. expression.

THE "GRAMMAIRE FRANÇOISE" OF CHARLES MAUPAS

In the volume on the *Formation de la langue classique*,¹ the third of the *Histoire de la langue française*, by M. Ferdinand Brunot, the point of departure is found in the results obtained from a study of Malherbe's Commentary on Desportes, published by M. Brunot in 1891 under the title *La doctrine de Malherbe*. It was in this study that the *Grammar* of Charles Maupas was first recognized as of paramount importance for the history of the formation of classic French.²

This *Grammar*, like many of those most valuable to historians of the French language, was written to teach French to foreigners. Copies of the first edition, published at Blois in 1607,³ are rare. The copy I found at Paris was in the Bibliothèque Mazarine. It contains on the fly-leaf at the end an autograph *note de service* by M. Brunot which reads:

Volume rare. Maupas raconte, dans la Préface d'une édition postérieure, qu'il n'avait d'abord fait tirer qu'un très petit nombre d'exemplaires de sa grammaire; il les distribuait à ses élèves étrangers, et on s'explique facilement de la sorte qu'ils se soient perdus pour la plupart.

¹ Part I, 1909; Part II, 1911.

² The importance placed upon this *Grammar* by M. Brunot inspired evidently the recent work of M. Emile Winkler: *La doctrine grammaticale française d'après Maupas et Oudin* (Beilheft XXXVIII zur ZRPh., 1912), Oudin being the "continuateur direct de Maupas" (*ibid.*, p. 3).

³ M. Winkler gives an interesting history of the book. It calls, however, for a few observations. To his "six éditions françaises et une traduction latine" (p. 6) there might have been added an English translation made by W. Aufield from the second French edition, London, 1634. There is a copy in the British Museum. To say also (p. 15) of the 1625 Paris reprint of the second edition that "Le seul exemplaire qu'on en connaisse se trouve à la Bibliothèque Ste.-Geneviève (X8° 332 Réserve. Comp. Brunot, Hist. III, 274)" is an error. The British Museum and Columbia University Library each possesses a copy. Unlike the copy of Ste.-Geneviève, they are bound alone, in the white vellum of the period. Apparently it was a copy similar to the one in Ste.-Geneviève, bound with the *Latin Grammar* of the same year (1625) of Philippus Garnerius, that was used for the Rouen edition of 1632, since the two are found bound together in this Rouen reprint in the copy in the Bibliothèque municipale de Brême, used by M. Winkler, and in the copy I myself found in the Bibliothèque municipale d'Avignon. M. Winkler made use of the 1618 edition as being more complete than the first (p. 10). The title-page of the second edition bears, it is true, the words "augmentée de moitié," but this is measurably true only of the part devoted to pronunciation (28 pages in the first edition, 41 pages in the second). Some new matter is elsewhere introduced, but enough is cut out or condensed to counterbalance this, so that the number of pages and of words to the page is the same in the two editions.

⁴ Mr. Barnard, an English bookseller, advertised not long since a copy of the second edition (1618) containing five leaves in manuscript, four containing the dedicatory letter

Cette édition de 1607 ne se trouve ni à la Sorbonne, ni au Musée pédagogique, ni à Ste.-Geneviève, ni à l'Arsenal. Stengel ne l'a trouvé en Allemagne qu' à Munich. Elle se trouve cependant dans la collection de M. le Comte de Signerolles. L'ouvrage, du reste, est fort important. Beaucoup de grammairiens postérieurs, jusqu'en 1640, le citent avec respect comme une autorité, principalement pour la syntaxe.

M. Brunot does not note that there is also a copy in the British Museum. It was there I first read it.

Six editions and two translations followed each other in a period of thirty-one years, an enviable record for a textbook of grammar at any period. A casual reading of it shows it to be the work of a sensible, thoughtful teacher. For Charles Maupas was a teacher of experience, and the work grew out of the necessities of his profession. Buckingham, to whom he writes a dedicatory letter,¹ had been one of his pupils. It cannot be supposed that his grammar had so long and useful a life because it had no rivals. From the time that Gautier de Biblesworth, toward the close of the thirteenth century, wrote his treatise on French to help the noble English lady Dionyse de Monchesney learn that tongue, every professor of a foreign language has been apt to feel at some period of his career an itching to give to the world what he conceives to be a new and royal road to its acquisition. And pupils of French were not wanting in the early seventeenth century. Pierre le Gaynard who published his Grammar in 1609, just two years after Maupas published his first edition, says:

Pour le jourd'huy la langue Françoise precelle toutes les autres en gravité, gentillesse, bonne grace, mignardise, et richesse. Et c'est pourquoy les estrangers viennent icy en France pour l'apprandre comme nos enfans apprenent le Latin et le Grec.²

Good sense and simplicity of language characterize the 386 pages of Maupas' *Grammar*. One even asks oneself at times during the reading of the book what progress has been made in grammar

to Buckingham that is found printed in subsequent editions, and the fifth bearing "obviously in the author's hand": "Memorial de perpetuelle servitude vouée à Mr. Willibrraham par moy Charles Maupas. A Blois ce dixhuitième Sepbre, 1618." The dedicatory letter to Buckingham is here dated "A Blois ceXIII Oct., 1618." This is not without interest, since this letter in the printed editions of Paris (1625) and Rouen (1632) bears the date, "A Blois ce penultiesme Sep. 1618." (cf. Winkler, p. 16). Unfortunately Mr. Barnard's copy was sold when my order reached him.

¹ Cf. Winkler, p. 11.

² P. 165.

making in the three hundred years that have elapsed since its first publication.¹

It is not surprising, therefore, that M. Brunot considers this grammar very important, nor would it be surprising to find him supporting on it the opinion that Malherbe's language was in general the same as Maupas'. The sober and straightforward fashion in which Maupas expresses himself, the reasonableness of his explanations, his exhortations to avoid ambiguity² and to take heed to usage³ suggest a certain kinship to Malherbe.

But it is no superficial resemblance of this sort that M. Brunot would find in the language requirements of the two men. The rules that Maupas gives in his grammar of 1607 are said almost always to coincide with the rules of Malherbe as deduced from his Commentary on Desportes. As this Commentary was made for the most part in 1606, it is only the edition of Maupas of 1607 that would be of any avail in the argument. M. Brunot appreciates this so well that he carefully indicates the date. It would be as difficult to show that Maupas was uninfluenced by Malherbe in the revision of his grammar in 1618 when Malherbe was at the height of his power, as it would be to prove that the first edition was made under Malherbe's inspiration. Malherbe, M. Brunot says,

ne connaît qu'un maître, l'usage. . . . Ce n'est pas sans dessein en effet que pour presque tous les articles qui suivent nous avons rapproché les doctrines de Malherbe de celles des contemporains et particulièrement de Maupas.

Celui-ci ne peut pas, comme Deimier, être soupçonné d'avoir écrit sous l'influence de Malherbe. Il enseignait le français au dehors avant que le nouveau maître fût connu, il publie une première édition de sa grammaire dès 1607, c'est à dire si tôt après l'arrivée de Malherbe à Paris, qu'il n'eût matériellement pas pu subir son action à temps, même s'il se fût trouvé

¹ Note Maupas' saying that the giving in full of the paradigm for the passive voice would be only "remplissage de papier" (p. 239). The author of a recent French grammar unwittingly followed Maupas' example in this, thinking he was making a wise innovation. The manner in which Maupas insists upon a student's learning the five principal parts of a verb and then forming the other tenses upon these has scarcely been improved (pp. 200 ff.): "Et puis que toute la conjugaison des verbes depend des cinq parties cy dessus mentionnées, comme il a été prouvé: Nous nous contenterons desormais de proposer sur chacune conjugaison les cinq parties de chaque verbe, desquelles, quiconque desire s'acquerir bonne et prompte intelligence de nostre langue, devra s'exercer à tirer tout le verbe selon les regles bâflees cydessus. Sauf a nous d'avertir s'il se trouve quelque irregularité ou observation particulière" (pp. 240-41).

² P. 117.

³ P. 339.

auprès de lui, et il n'y était pas. Or, nous verrons que presque partout les règles que donnent Maupas et Malherbe coïncident."¹

The detailed exposition that follows does not seem, curiously enough, to warrant this last statement. Not only do Maupas and Malherbe agree not more than once out of three times, but when they do agree, it is upon well-established usages. Upon the firing line they stand back to back rather than shoulder to shoulder. Take, for example, the rule that the subject pronoun should regularly be expressed.² Maupas definitely states this just as Malherbe implies it. But Maupas proceeds to give three groups of cases in which such omission is allowed. Setting aside the first group, which may be considered archaic expressions, though nothing is said to this effect, Maupas approves by precept and example the omission of the subject pronoun of the first and second persons "en suite de propos." Malherbe scores Desportes repeatedly for their omission.³ Again, in a co-ordinate sentence following *et* and *si* "où la personne a été suffisamment exprimée," the personal pronoun subject may be omitted according to Maupas, and the point is illustrated by two examples: "Vous m'avez bien conseillé, et vous croiray une autre fois. Il vous respecte et si vous servira bien." The omission in the first of these sentences would fall under the condemnation of Malherbe, and in the second the expression of the subject pronoun after *et* would be equally blameworthy. That is to say, Malherbe's rule⁴ that the subject pronoun of a co-ordinate sentence must never be expressed when it is the same as in the principal sentence but that otherwise its expression is obligatory, was unknown to Maupas. This seems quite enough to raise in the reader's mind the question of the justness of M. Brunot's generalization that Maupas' rules almost always coincide with Malherbe's.

But this is not all. The fact that a few of the notes made from the second⁵ edition were overlooked in the revision made later from the first edition of the Grammar is a negligible matter,⁶ compared

¹ Doct., p. 221.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 378 ff.

³ Malherbe, *Oeuvres*, ed. Lalanne, pp. 268, 290, 305, 317, 324 (3), 325, 336, 338, 339, 363(2), 364(2), etc.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 273, 336, 361, 367, 370, 400, 402, 404, etc.; cf. Doct., pp. 381 f.

⁵ Doct., p. 339, note.

⁶ They are for the most part references to Maupas not found in the edition of 1607, such as: "Maupas dit qu'il [attraire] a le défini beaucoup plus en usage que le simple

with the number of forms and words condemned by Malherbe in Desportes that are found in Maupas and escaped M. Brunot's notice.

Ains,¹ according to Malherbe a "veil mot qui ne vaut rien," *ainçois*,² a "mauvais mot," *nuisance*,³ *maint*,⁴ *guerdonner*,⁵ *bienheurer*,⁶ condemned for similar reasons, are all found in Maupas as if they were in good and regular standing.

The conjugation of the verb *duire*,⁷ banished by Malherbe, is given by Maupas as if it were very much alive. The conjunction *si que*,⁸ given without remark by Maupas, is called by Malherbe "veil langage dont on n'use plus et qui était hors d'usage du temps de Desportes." *Accroist*⁹ for *accroissement*, which Malherbe noted in Desportes as a word he had never heard, is used by Maupas: "pour apporter un accroist et accessoire à la chose," etc. If Maupas does not use the verb *parangonner*,¹⁰ scored by Malherbe as being a foreign word, he uses the derivative to characterize one of his groups of adverbs: "De similitude et parangonnement."

Poursuivre,¹¹ though condemned by Malherbe as a "mot normand," is given by Maupas as if equally honorable with *poursuivre*. *Nud*¹² is "gascon" in the opinion of Malherbe; Maupas recognizes this form with *d* as the only one for the masculine. *Ce disant*,¹³ *En esgard*,¹⁴ *joint que*,¹⁵ *non obstant*,¹⁶ *notoire*,¹⁷ *vu que*,¹⁸ *cet esgard*,¹⁹ all the expressions to which objection is made by Malherbe on the ground that they "sentent leur chicane,"²⁰ are used by Maupas. Malherbe

traire,¹ (Doct., p. 256; Maup., 259); "perray est donné comme étant moins en usage que parolstray" (Doct., p. 270; Maup., p. 256); "alarme" (Doct., p. 357; Maup., p. 83 ff.); "guide"² (Doct., p. 358; Maup., p. 90), etc. Under *bénin* (Doct., p. 259) we should read: "Maupas enseigne comment il forme son féminin en *ins*" (Maup., p. 78).

¹ Maup., pp. 79, 378, 380; Doct., pp. 254 f.

² Maup., pp. 379, 380; Doct., p. 255.

³ Maup., p. 321; Doct., p. 267.

⁴ Maup., pp. 76, 115, 119, etc.; Doct., p. 266.

⁵ Maupas uses it in a model sentence, p. 95; Doct., p. 263.

⁶ Given in the second edition as an example for the pronunciation of *eu*, p. 30; Doct., p. 257.

⁷ Maup., p. 249; Doct., p. 260.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 368.

⁸ Maup., p. 349; Doct., p. 274.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 362.

⁹ Maup., p. 382; Doct., p. 284.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 13, 10, 17, 154, 189, etc.

¹⁰ Maup., p. 364; Doct., p. 298.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 15, 334.

¹¹ Maup., p. 262; Doct., p. 302.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

¹² Maup., p. 77; Doct., p. 364.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹³ Maup., p. 145.

²⁰ Doct., p. 307.

made severe restrictions upon the use of adjectives for adverbs. Maupas accepts "un grand nombre qui au genre masculin ou neutre comme entre les Grecs et Latins sont employez adverbialement;" "Pour parler correct, il faut suivre ces reigles."¹ Legier,² thus condemned, is in the list. *Cherement*³ as well as *cher*, is allowed by Maupas with verbs of buying and selling, contrary to the requirement of Malherbe.

Most noticeable, perhaps, is the omission⁴ of all reference to Maupas on the subject of the euphonic *t*. Malherbe corrects Desportes for saying "me paiera l'on toujours" instead of "me paierat-on." One of Maupas' references⁵ to the euphonic *t* covers a similar case:

Quand un verbe finissant en *a* est suivi de l'un de ces mots *il, elle, on*, lors en parlant, et quelquefois en écrit, nous interposons un *t*, pour remplir le bâillement qui se feroit à la rencontre des deux voyelles: vray que rarement il se trouve écrit . . . pour le regard de ceste syllabe *on*, nous luy mettons souvent une *l* devant pour remplir: Exem. "Que fera l'on au bois sec, si l'on fait ces choses au bois verd?"

In M. Brunot's later volume, reference is made to Maupas on this subject,⁶ but the reference is more inexplicable still than the omission in the earlier work. The discussion of the euphonic *t* closes with the words: "Chez Maupas, il n'y a plus trace de la prononciation sans *t*."

There are many requirements of Malherbe upon which Maupas is silent. On the creation of derivatives he has nothing to say of adjectives in *-in*, such as *ivoirin, marbrin*, etc., to which Malherbe "donne congé,"⁷ or of those in *-eux*, as *angoisseux*, which seem strange to Malherbe. He does not concern himself much about the confusion or abuse of words, or their proper definition.⁸ *Soudain* and *soudainement*⁹ are given under adverbs of *hastiveté* without any distinction between the two being noted.

In the same way are given *complainte*¹⁰ and *plainte, dès* and *depuis*.¹¹

¹ Maup., pp. 333, 348.

⁴ Maup., pp. 4 f.

² *Ibid.*, p. 348; Doct., p. 361.

⁵ *Histoire la langue française*, II, 333.

³ Maup., p. 280; Doct., p. 359.

⁷ Doct., p. 284.

⁴ Doct., p. 405.

⁸ In the second edition, *neuf* and *nouveau* are distinguished (p. 79).

⁹ Maup., p. 364; Doct., p. 318.

¹¹ Doct., p. 478; Maup., p. 343.

¹⁰ Doct., p. 318; Maup., p. 340.

Maupas has little to say against the poetical licenses of which Malherbe was so bitter an opponent. While agreeing in general with Malherbe in saying that past participles used adjectively follow their nouns, he adds: "Ce qui toutefois n'est pas nécessaire, spécialement en vers, où il y a une large licence de changer l'ordre coutumier."¹

The old word *cil*,² obsolete in Maupas' time, is recorded by him as being used for *celui* in poetry, while Malherbe, finding it in Desportes, cannot endure it.

Maupas records that *i* in the conjunction *si*³ is elided before *il*, *ils*, and "quelquefois en vers,⁴ *s'elle*, *s'elles*, *s'on* pour *si elle*, *si elles*, *si on*," a contraction looked upon by Malherbe as a fault and scored repeatedly in Desportes. "Si ne se mange jamais" is his dictum. Maupas countenances also in poetry the elision of *e* in *elle* and *grande*⁵ for which Desportes is corrected. On the possessive pronoun⁶ Maupas says: "Et bien qu'avec l'article défini ils rejettent l'accointance du substantif expres, toutefois les poëtes par une certaine license disent aucune-fois, *Le cœur mien*, etc." Finally, to complete Maupas' references to poetical license, we may quote his words on inversion of the natural order of words: "Car ces langages, *j'ay enhuy une belle leçon apprise* . . . sont hors d'usage, sinon en vers où, peut estre, on les pourroit passer."⁷

Maupas and Malherbe, "tous deux prennent à une même source: l'usage."⁸ But usage for Maupas meant quite a different thing from the meaning attached to it by Malherbe. Usage for Malherbe was "la langue épurée du bon usage."⁹ Maupas, on the contrary, attempts to record all the forms he hears or has noted in his reading. In the

¹ Malherbe, *Oeuvres*, ed. Lalanne, IV, 365; Maup., p. 117. We know that Malherbe did not always follow his own rules. Maupas in practice not infrequently violates Malherbe's rules and sometimes his own: cf. "En tous lesquels langages se ressent une cachee signification de vehemence ou abondance" (p. 47), where he violates not only his own rule on the position of the past participle, but Malherbe's rules requiring the expression of the anticipative subject (ed. Lalanne, IV, 386), and the repetition of the preposition *de* (Doct., p. 471), rules of which Maupas was ignorant.

² In 1607, given in the list of words in which *l* is not liquid (p. 14); in the second edition are added the words: "Cil, signifiant celuy en poesie, car quand il signifie le poil qui est au dessus des yeux, il liquefie l'" (p. 17).

³ P. 27; Doct., p. 518.

⁴ Maup., p. 174.

⁴ P. 28; Doct., p. 518.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 334.

⁵ P. 28; Doct., p. 363.

⁸ Doct., p. 222; cf. *Histoire de la langue française*, III, 9.

⁹ Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, p. 358.

Introduction to his second edition he states more at length how he made his Grammar.¹ Maupas used the scientific method. In the current phraseology of our day, his work was the product of original research. He is no reformer or leader of fashion like Malherbe. By the side therefore of more modern forms, and with no indication that they should be avoided, we find among other old forms, the first person imperfect and conditional in *e*: *-oy*, *-oye*, ou *-ois*.²

Three pages are devoted to diminutives, dear to the heart of the sixteenth century. The whole gamut is given: *homme*, *hommeau*, *hommet*, *hommelet*, etc.³ Two pages are devoted to the old particle of affirmation, *mon*, as if it were very much alive: *C'aura mon*; *ce faut mon*; *ce veux mon*; *ce fay mon*, etc.⁴ The frequent use of the negative *non* in answers is conspicuous, the pronoun subject unexpressed: *Non feray*, *non ay*, *non faut*, etc.⁵

Maupas seldom refers to any authority. Marot is quoted on the order of words.⁶ On the use of the *conjonction si* he cites Plutarque:⁷ "Voyez en multitude d'exemples és œuvres de Plutarque, et ailleurs assez." Besides these,⁸ there are two references to Ronsard: "Jadis on a dit *Gaigneur*," he says, "pour *plus grand*: Mais il n'est plus en usage vulgaire: bien s'en sert-on quelquefois és actes de judicature et se trouve en Ronsard, excellent Poète."⁹ And again, to justify giving another old form, under the conjugation of the verb *clore*: "Je clos, je closi, j'ay clos, cloorre, closant. Je le voudrois ainsi former pour le mieux. Toutefois vous lirez dans M. de Ronsard, Esclouit, pour la 3. personne du defini indicatif du verbe *esclorre*".¹⁰ This polite and even timid statement of his opinion by Maupas in the face of so excellent a poet as Ronsard, stands in vivid contrast to the judgments of Malherbe who would have stricken out all Ronsard.

¹ Winkler, pp. 7 ff.

² Maup., pp. 202, 205, etc.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 350 ff.

⁵ In the second edition there is a reference to *Desportes*. In speaking of the use of the acute accent over *e*, there is added to the statement of the first edition: "rarement est-il marqué au milieu, si ce n'est de quelque Docte et curieux écrivain, comme a fait Maistre Philippe des Portes, en sa dernière édition des Pseaumes qu'il a élégamment mis en rimes Francoises," etc. (p. 8).

⁶ P. 92.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 354, etc.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 269; cf. Winkler, p. 290.

⁹ Maup., p. 373.

¹⁰ P. 262.

In the third volume of M. Brunot's *Histoire de la langue française*, reference is made to archaisms¹ in Maupas, in connection with the repetition of the statement formulated eighteen years before, that Maupas and Malherbe almost always agree:

Mais en général il [Malherbe] se borne à suivre l'usage, et c'est là le secret de son succès. On le voit clairement, lorsqu'on compare sa doctrine à celle des grammairiens contemporains, comme Maupas (1607) qui n'ont pu subir en aucune façon son influence. Ils sont par endroits plus archaïques que lui, mais les différences qui résultent des conditions respectives de chacun mises à part, l'accord entre Maupas et Malherbe est presque constant.²

Whatever construction be put upon the phrase, "les conditions respectives de chacun mises à part," the conclusion that the agreement between Maupas and Malherbe is "presque constant," is still a hard saying. There is the same discrepancy in this volume as in the earlier one between the generalizations and the detailed exposition.³ A little farther on we find: "Maupas s'emporte à diverses reprises contre les courtisans 'singes de nouveautés.'"⁴ No more definite reference is given for this assertion. The 1607 edition of Maupas, being the only one⁵ supposedly under consideration, we should expect to find it here. But the expression "singes de nouveautés" is not found in the first edition. It is found, however, in the revised edition, made eleven years later, that is to say, when Malherbe was at the height of his power, among his remarks upon the pronunciation of the diphthong *-oi*.⁶ For the page and a half⁷ in

¹ Some old forms, not noted in the preceding volumes as found in Maupas, are here recognized as given by him. There is in Maupas, however, no suggestion that they were archaic. Noteworthy are the past infinitive construed without a preposition as if it were preceded by *après* (cf. III, 589, and *Les navigations de Pantagruel* by M. Lefranc, p. 191, note), and expressions on the model of "arrivé que fut." Maupas treats of the latter not only on p. 299, but again on p. 335 (cf. III, 599).

² III, 9.

³ Of the *adverbes proscrits* (III, 349 ff.), for example, on which both Maupas and Malherbe are cited, Malherbe condamns *à coup*, *à la parf'm*, *à qui mieux mieux*, *ça bas*, *du depuis*, *jâ*, *onc*, *or*, *ores*, *paravent*, all given by Maupas without remark, besides *ains* and *ainçois* on which Maupas might have been cited. On the other hand *tandis* used by Malherbe is given by Maupas and Maupas does not give *finablement* blamed by Malherbe.

⁴ III, 24.

⁵ See citation above from p. 9.

⁶ Quoted almost verbatim by Thurot *De la prononciation française*, I, 377. In the preparation of this work Thurot used only the 1625 Paris reprint of the second edition of Maupas.

⁷ Maupas (1625), bottom of p. 31 to middle of p. 33.

the second edition on *-oi*, there is in the first edition¹ the single sentence: "Oi sonne comme *oe*, *foy*, *loy*, *trois*, *mois*, etc."

There are other cases in which Maupas does not seem to be fairly represented. Mention has been made above to the space devoted to diminutives by Maupas. The subject is resumed² by M. Brunot in the words:

Maupas étudie encore la manière dont se dérivent les diminutifs, car les "Poètes emploient d'assez bonne grâce, ces noms rustiques és Elogues, Pastorelles et chansonnettes champêtres."³

But these words of Maupas apply only to diminutives of proper nouns:

Plusieurs noms propres reçoivent diminution et ce faisant deviennent noms rustiques et raillards. Jacques, Jacquet, et le feminin usité, Jacquette, Jean, Janot, Janin, qui est pris pour epithète ridicule d'un duquel la femme se preste: Et le feminin Janneton, Pierre, Pierrot, et le feminin, Perrette, Perrichon, Philippes, Philippot, Charles, Charlot, Charlotte, Marguerite, Margot. Les poètes emploient, etc.

Of the diminutives of common nouns and adjectives nothing is said that would give the slightest suggestion that they had lost caste or were for poetical use.

Again, on comparatives, M. Brunot says:

Maupas ne donne plus d'autres comparatifs synthétiques que ceux que nous avons encore: *meilleur*, etc. (91). Oudin, en reprenant la liste, ajoute qu'on emploie tout aussi bien les formes analytiques: plus mauvais, plus petit, plus mal.⁴

But Maupas even in the 1607 edition says, immediately after giving the synthetic forms:

Nous disons aussi plus mauvais, plus petit: mais non, plus bon, et leurs adverbes de même.⁵

On the formation of the plural M. Brunot writes an interesting paragraph.⁶ After stating that three signs, *s*, *x*, and *z*, purely graphic distinctions, indicate the plural, he continues:

Z s'emploie généralement derrière un *é* pour marquer qu'il est fermé: *beauté*, *beautez* (Oud., Gr. 83). Dès le XVI^e siècle, mais surtout à partir

¹ Maupas (1607), p. 23.

⁴ III, 283.

² III, 206.

⁵ Maupas (1607), p. 91.

³ Maup., p. 98.

⁶ III, 281.

d'Oudin, on enseigne qu'il faut tenir la syllabe un peu plus longuette (Maup., 1625, 23).

It is doubtful whether any one would suspect from this Maupas' real doctrine.¹

The citation of M. Brunot "(1625, 23)," is found under the rules for the pronunciation of *s*.² In the same edition under *z*, we read: "A la fin aussi est comme une *s*, mais elle allonge grandement la syllabe: Ce que les estrangers doivent soigneusement noter et n'y faillir la où l'*e* est long à la dernière syllabe, *lenez*,³ *beautez*, *jouez*. Car quand l'*e*, à la dernière syllabe est long, il le faut accompagner du *Z*, comme l'*s* est marque ordinairement de l'*e* bref à la dernière."⁴ The same doctrine is found but less distinctly expressed in the edition of 1607: "A la fin ne vaut qu'*s*, mais allonge grandement la syllabe: Ce que les estrangers doivent noter soigneusement, parce qu'ils sont trop coustoniers d'y faillir: *nez*, *parlez*, *bonteuz*".⁵

Attention has already been called⁶ to the fact that the 1638 Rouen edition of Maupas' *Grammar* is a simple reprint of the 1625 Paris edition. The references of M. Brunot, therefore, to the edition of Maupas' *Grammar*, "due à son fils," are meaningless,⁷ if not misleading. The effect is most curious when Maupas fils is cited and not Maupas' first edition, when the latter teaches the same rule as the former. *Avant que* and *premier que*, for example, "veulent le conjonctif" is Maupas' rule, even in 1607.⁸

Enough has perhaps been said to show that a critical edition of Maupas' grammar is highly desirable and it is to be hoped that M. Brunot will still fulfil his promise⁹ to publish such an edition. The work of M. Winkler¹⁰ is difficult to use in a discussion of the

¹ M. Winkler omits all consideration of Maupas' rules of pronunciation. These are interesting in themselves, and a comparison of them as they appear in 1607 and in 1625 (the edition used by Thurot) is instructive.

² "Prononcer l'*s* au bout des mots, n'est point à reprendre pourveu que foiblement. Et quand on la voudra supprimer, si faut l'tenir la syllabe un peu plus longuette." The last sentence is not found in the edition of 1607.

³ *sic*; = *tenez*?

⁴ Maupas (1625), p. 26.

⁵ *Ibid.* (1607), p. 20.

⁶ E. Winkler, *La doctrine grammaticale française d'après Maupas et Oudin*, p. 17. My own researches had anticipated the conclusion of M. Winkler.

⁷ *Histoire de la langue française*, III, xxv, 274, 285, 287, 292, 299, 300, 307, 311, 350, n. 1, 356, 478, 490, 494, 499, 516, 568, 577, 584, n. 1, etc.

⁸ Cf. III, 577, and Maupas (1607), pp. 310, 380.

⁹ *Histoire de la langue française*, III, 30, note.

¹⁰ Cf. p. 107, n. 3, above.

formation of classic French because Maupas' doctrine in 1607 is here bound up, not only with his doctrine in 1618, but also, and still more unfortunately, with the doctrine of Oudin in 1632. But more than this, Maupas' *Grammar* as a literary product of intrinsic interest in itself is worthy of a reprint.¹ As it is, the rarity of the book makes it a dead letter for the majority of students.

LUCY M. GAY

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

¹M. Brunot now writes me that he is "en train d'organiser le Corpus des grammairiens français." I have agreed to prepare the edition of Maupas under M. Brunot's direction.

FRONTON DU DUC'S "PUCELLE D'ORLÉANS"

The Wadsworth Athenaeum Library at Hartford, Connecticut, contains a copy of the *Histoire tragique de la Pucelle d'Orléans*, written by the Jesuit scholar, Fronton du Duc, and performed in 1580 before Charles III, Duke of Lorraine. This copy is one, No. 90, of 105 reprinted with typographical corrections in 1859 by P. Toussaint, a bibliophile of Pont-à-Mousson, where the original edition had been pirated by J. Barnet in 1581. Both editions are rare. I have to thank Professor C. H. C. Wright, of Harvard University, for reference to the summary of the play in Vol. III, p. 446, of the *Histoire du théâtre français* of the Frères Parfaict. No other accounts seem to exist.

The value of the play appears to the writer somewhat signal for the history of the classic spirit and style in French drama; it makes much more intelligible for me the transition from fifteenth-century moralities and mysteries to *Polyeucte*, *Saint-Genest*, and, indeed, *Athalie*. Here we have the mold of the Senecan tragedy, rather Buchanan's than Garnier's, used for religious subject-matter, a throng of characters like Gringore's, and lyric choruses that, like those of Montchrestien, bear the burden of a somewhat personal reflection on passing events.

More significant than the form, however, in showing the slow evolution from late mediaeval classicism¹ to that of the *grand siècle*

¹ Cf. Eustache Deschamps, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. G. Raynaud, Paris, 1891, VII, 266 ff.:

"Art de dictier

"Rethorique est science de parler droitlement et a quatre parties en soy ramenées, toutes appliquées a son nom; car tout bon rethoricien doit parler et dire ce qu'il veult monstrar, saigement, briefment, substancieusement et hardiment."

Christine de Pizan, *Le Livre de Paix*, MS Fr. 1182, fol. 84 ff.:

"III. RETHORIQUE

"Nihil est tam praeclarum aut tam magnificum quod non moderatione temperam desideret.

"Veult dire Valero, cy dessus allegué, qu'il n'est chose tant parfaitement belle, grande et magnifique comme celle qui est menée par attempance et moderation. Dit Aristote en *Politique* que il n'est quelconque chose qui n'ait besoing d'estre menée par ordre. Et pour ce que eloquence est le parement du monde, la peinture ou aour[usement] du corps, et reputacion de l'entendement de l'homme, et que c'est chose qui moult a valu et peut valoir, appartient que regle y soit tenu, si dit que ung chose principale est

is the disposition of the author as this shows itself in his style. *Ordonnance, mesure, clarté, justesse*, the classical cardinal virtues, are vital constraints in his manner. But these are not negative with him; they have their animating principle in the large conception of equity and reason which Roman law handed on to scholastic philosophy, and which the last great mediaeval mystics, who are also the first modern psychologists, turned into the current of the Renaissance. This principle Charron, also a cleric, in the same generation, defined as "La loi de nature, c'est à dire l'équité et la raison universelle qui luit et éclaire en chacun de nous."¹

le regard de bel et bien parler, la première en qualité, la seconde en quantité, la tierce en netteté, et la quarte en tardesse. En qualité c'est à celuy qui veult parler doit avoir avis sur ung chose la personne qui il est, la seconde a qui il veult adresser ses parolles. La tierce de quel matière il veult dire, la quarte quel espace il a de parler. Et la V^e a quel fin il veult venir."

Christine here, like Eustache Deschamps and like Gerson, bases her rhetoric on the famous *Arte loquendi et facundi* of Alberto of Brescia (cf. Thor Sundby, *Brunetos Latinos "Lernet og Skrifter,"* Copenhagen, 1869, pp. XCIV ff.), but, like Gerson apparently, she may also have known Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. She seems to have known, too, Horace's *Arte poetica*, though for her reiterated motto, "comme ce soit souveraine chose avoir faconde et langaige bel et mené par attrempance," which paraphrases Horace's

Nec facundia deseret hunc: nec lucidus ordo,

she mentions Cicero's *De oratore* as authority.

Cf. too Christine's paraphrase of the pseudo-Senecan *Formula de honesta vita*, or *Quattuor virtutes*, her "Livre a l'enseignement de bien vivre," MS Fr. 2240, fol. 5vo ff.: "Glose: C'est que en gracieusté et courtoisie ne doit point avoir de mignotise ou precieusté, si qu'il semble que on le face pour apparoir plus gracieux et plus courtois." etc.

The existence of "precision," at this time is curious. Even more austere and authoritative is Gerson's Letter (*Opera omnia*, I, col. 104) to the students of the Collège de Navarre:

"Contemnere claras & solidas doctrinas quae leves videntur, & ad obscuriores se transference, signum est curiositatis & originalis corruptilae, poenitentiae & credulitati aduersae. Nulla est in omni doctrina major virtus quam claritas, neque evidenter aliud hatur excellentis ingenii & clari argumentum, quam ex claritate dictorum vel scriptorum. Obscurum siquidem ingenium & confusum impossibile est ut perspicue resolute quiequam edoceat: verumtamen apud multorum curiositatem tanta est judicil corruptio, quale in me alias fuisse non nego, quod latinitas aliqua vel stylus eo judicetur pulchrior, quo difficilior, & quo turgidior, & ex consequenti vitiisior, eo elegantior appareat: cum longe alter sit. Omnis enim oratio quanto clarior, tanto est speciosior, atque laudabilior; nisi forte abjecte omni elegancia & accurateone toto sordeat, languet & effluat."

¹ Quoted by Bonnefon, *Montaigne et ses amis*, II, 271, Paris, 1898. Cf. Boileau, *Satire XI*, especially the passage beginning,

Dans le monde il n'est rien de beau que l'équité,

and ending,

Tous ces fiers conquérants, rois, princes, capitaines,
Sont moins grands à mes yeux que ce bourgeois d'Athènes
Qui sut, pour tous exploits, doux, modéré, frugal,
Toujours vers la justice aller d'un pas égal.

Cf. too, for the scholastic medium by which the antique ideal of equity was handed down in the Middle Ages, the definition of Thomas Aquinas, "Lex aeterna est summa ratio

For Fronton du Duc, as for the classicists of the early fifteenth century, Gerson, Christine de Pizan, Eustache Deschamps, and Alain Chartier, the antique Reason has a mystical element, as it has again for Corneille. "Where humility is, there is Wisdom"—*Ubi humilitas, ibi sapientia*—had been Gerson's device; he loved the one, he sought the other, pondering the *Magnificat*, and taking home to his business and bosom the Psalmist's *constatation*:

Declaracio sermonorum tuorum illuminat et intellectum dat parrulis.

"La declaracion de tes paroles enlumine et donne entendement aux petits; c'est a dire aux humbles."¹

In this mood of mystical humanism, reached by moments only in the sixteenth century,² Fronton du Duc approaches his subject—the Tragic History of the Maid of Orleans. His theme is really the mystical, intuitive reason against the world, the tragedy of the worldly judgment passed on unworldliness.

In the epode to the chorus at the end of Act IV, Fronton du Duc paints apparently, if not his own moral portrait, at least his moral ideal:

Heureux celuy qui constant
Ne faict broncher sa justice

"cui semper obtemerandum est," quoted by Adolphe Franck, *Réformateurs et publicistes de l'Europe, Moyen-âge et Renaissance*, pp. 39 ff., Paris, 1864.

Gerson sums up the doctrine repeatedly in his psychological treatise, *De mystica theologia* (*Opera omnia*, Vol. III, col. 382, ed. Dupin, Antwerp, 1703), with its central conception of the *intelligentia simplex*, "a direct intuition of the Light Divine," in his *Dialogue du cuer mondain et du cuer seulet* (*Opera omnia*, Vol. III), and not less nobly and touchingly in the still unpublished *Bons enseignemens pour endocriner simples gens* (MS Fr. 25548, fol. 86 ff., Bib. Nat., Paris):

"Puis que ainsi est que Dieu nous a tant dignement creez outre les bestes, a son image, ballant memoire, entendement et volonté pour le congoisstro, amer et servir . . . c'est bien raison que nous le servons de tout comme loyaux subjectz leur souverain seigneur, comme enfants naturellez leur vray pere."

¹ Translated by Raoul de Presles, about 1370, for Charles le Sage (MS Fr. 962, fol. 209, Bib. Nat., Paris), *Vulgata Ps. 118:130*.

² The finest poetic example I know is that of Passerat's *Hymne du sauveur Jésus*:

O fontaine de pitié,
Source de vraye amitié:
Nulle vertu sans ta grace
Ne se donne a nostre race.
L'honnête vie, et durable renom
Est propre a ceux qui celebrant ton Nom.
Le laict de la mamelle
De ta sagesse immortelle
De goutte divinemente
Alaicté l'entendement
De nous petits, et a par la rousée
De ton esprit nostre bouche arroussé.

Cf. *Recueil des œuvres poétiques de Jean Passerat*, Paris, 1606, p. 100; also, Hatzfeld and Darmesteter, *Morceaux choisis des auteurs du XVI^e siècle*, Paris, s.d., p. 273.

Prise par le don flatant
 D'une prodigue malice
 Ni du menaçant effort
 D'un chef, quoy que beau et fort.

The note of elegiac regret for the undue complexities of living, and, above all, of living in courts, has sometimes seemed, and been classed as, a hallmark of the French Renaissance. And certainly the *Pléiade* poets and their imitators abound on the theme caught up from the *O fortunatus* of Virgil, and the *Beatus ille* of Horace, but they have too their precursors and their echoes. The *Dit de franc Gontier*¹ of Philippe de Vitry in the fourteenth century, the *Stances à Tircis* of Racan in the seventeenth, with the active retreat of Port-Royal, belong together at the extremes of a wave of real as well as literary *Contemptus mundi*, based on poignant deceptions.

Of the nature of these deceptions and of their composition the *Histoire tragique* gives an acute analysis and picture—a universal experience studied in a too terrible example.

The tragic history of the Maid is intended to work a purgation by pity and fear in the hearers—to cure or modify spiritual blindness, and check the cruelties of worldly pride:

Messieurs, C'est à l'honneur du Pays de Lorraine
 Au fruit de la jeunesse, affin qu'elle s'aprenne
 Aux artz et aux vertus, que ce peuple joyeux
 Est venu pour ouyr, non des comiques jeux,
 Mais plutost, en poulsant une voix plus hardie,
 L'on pretend vous monstrar, en une tragedie,
 Un spectacle plus grave, affin que gravement
 L'esprit se norissant, se forme sagement.

Like Corneille's and Rotrou's mysteries, like Racine's last and greatest choral tragedies, then, this is a work ethical and religious in purpose; like other heroic compositions—the *Franciade*, the *Ode sur la prise de Namur*, and the *Pucelle* of Chapelain—of its own and the next century it is also patriotic:

On a trouvé chez nous suffisante matière
 Pour d'un poème tel fournir la charge entière.

Experience and insight aiding his critical scholarship, Fronton du Duc sets out to tell what really happened when the Maid appeared

¹ Cf. Arthur Piaget, *Romania*, XXVII, 64.

before the Court at Chinon, and, afterward, to give the moral history of her mission and death. It is noteworthy that he knows and uses the manifestoes¹ in behalf of Jeanne which issued from Gerson's following. Barnet refers in his preface to these sources, "Gerson et Henry de Gorchheim," who "rendent suffisant tesmoignage par deux Apologies qu'ilz en ont faict paroistre partout."

Fronton du Duc is most interesting in the discussions in which he dramatizes this congenial material; he seems to have known from documents, or imagined with much force and finesse, the sort of arguments which Gerson is apparently answering in his tract. By the Chancelier we may understand correctly enough, if not Jean Cauchon, Jean Chuffart, who succeeded on Gerson's disgrace to the post of Chancellor of Paris. The Bishop is perhaps meant for Henry of Gorchheim, and by the Docteur en Théologie, Gerson himself.

We do not find from Monstrelet or other historical sources that the three actually met with the Dauphin and the Duc d'Alençon in conference at Chinon. But a controversy did take place, reaching to Gerson's Paulist convent at Lyons, from which he wrote in May, 1429.

This controversy is so complicated in its elements—political, critical, metaphysical, social—that no full account can be attempted here. Gerson's following, nourished on St. Augustine's *City of God*, and on Boëthius, on the Victorine mystics, Hugo, Richard, and St. Bonaventura, were highly strung persons for whom ideas²—especially the image-ideas of the Trinity, memory, understanding, and will—really existed in "a true commonweal which is God." Their opponents had a less sublimated perception and little tendency to view men as by their end and nature created for communion with Universal Reason, as beings "sharing their understanding with the angels,"³ in especial the lowly and meek. Where Gerson's psychol-

¹ Gerson, *Opera omnia*, Vol. IV, col. 864 ff., ed. Dupin, Antwerp, 1703.

² Cf. *Polyeucte*, IV, 111:

 Saintes douceurs du ciel, adorables idées,
 Vous remplissez un cœur qui vous peut recevoir:
 De vos sacrés attraitz les âmes possédées
 Ne conçoivent plus rien qui les puisse émouvoir.

³ Alain Chartier, *Consolation des trois Vertus*, ed. Duchesne, Paris, 1617:

"*Foy*: Que songes tu, Entendement raisonnable, Image de l'éternelle unité, cler ruisselet decourant de la source de vie, ray issant de la resplendissour du souverain soleil, dont nul ne puet foyr la chaleur, rayant en corps humain pour enluminer les tenebres des mortels. Tu fuz crée par le souverain ouvrier, qui point ne chome. Tu

ogy above all exalted, "cette voix divine qui sonne en voulenté,"¹ his enemies saw mania, sorcery, witchcraft, in defiance of the world and its methods. Jeanne d'Arc may be seen as the victim of these two extremes of opinion, produced by the one fashion of understanding, ruined by the other. So at least the Jesuit scholar envisages her in his *Histoire tragique*, with no uncertain disposition of his sympathies.

In the first act a pious Dauphin, a devoted Duc d'Alençon, and the Maid, archetype of intuitive understanding, appear. In the second, the Doctors examine and deliberate:

LE CHANCELLIER

Sire, selon le veul de vostre Majesté
Je mettrai en avant cette difficulté
Qu'on pouroit amener. Naguères on a veue
Une peste d'erreurs par le monde espandue,

fus ores conjoint a corps humain, pour gouverner la partie vegetative despotiquement, & l'appetit sensitif par seigneurie royale et politique. . . . Quel legier desarrest t'a ainsi demarchié de ton ordre. Entendement espirituel? Fus-tu baillé à l'omme pour servir aux passions sensuelles, ou pour les refrenier? N'a pas la commixtion de l'omme son estre communiquant avec les pierres, son vivre avec les plantes, sentir avecques les bestes, et entendre avecques les anges?"

¹ Gerson, "Dialogue du cuer mondain et du cuer seul" (*Opera omnia*, ed. Dupin, Antwerp, 1706, Vol. III, col. 886 ff.): "L'entendement, ou la vertu intellectuelle, est dicte cesser de toute son operacion par la maniere qui ja n'est aucunement touche: c'est que l'entendement ne pense a quelconque creé, ou qui se puet creer, se non a Dieu; & encores ne pense-il point par clere vision, car il est en l'obscurité de foy, & en divines tenebres. Mais il persoit bien en escoutant la voix de ce hault chant, qui est la voix de l'amour, qui fait trembler, mouvoir & reformer la souveraine partie volitive ou affective. En ceste haulte game l'entendement n'a point son operacion ou affection pour regarder les fantomes de l'imagination, ne les sciences de raison, soit haulte ou basse; mais prent tant seulement sa congoissance par entendre ceste voix divine qui sonne en voulenté.

"Si avons parlé du chant qui appartient a creature raisonnable, pour ce mortel pelerinage, en tant que son chant approuche plus a celuy de paradis en pardurable eternité, lequel chant du cuer nous disons *Canticordium* de la haulte game qui appartient au cuer, depuis qu'il a esté sensuel, puis espirituell & devenu celestial, c'est assavoir a devocion, a speculacion, puis a contemplacion. Dieu, chant nouvel te chanteray, de tout mon cuer te loueray:

Salve Mater pietatis
Et totius Trinitatis
Nobile Tricinium.
Verbi tamen incarnati
Speciale majestati
Praeparens hospitium.

(This is, of course, a strophe from the famous hymn of Adam of St. Victor, perhaps the finest poem of its kind in the Middle Ages, and possibly the finest Christian lyric in any language. According to the legend, the Virgin appeared to Adam at this point in recognition.)

"En humain cuer sont maintes puissances & vertus, lesquelles congoistre est moult expedient, pour parvenir au chant du cuer que nous disons, *Canticordium*. Mais en especial sont trois vertus, que nous disons memoire, entendement & voulenté, selon lesquelles on prent puissance, sapience, et bienveillance, qui constituent liberté. L'esprit & entendement apparaivoient bien la voix & l'oyent seule et divine qui se chante en ceste partie volative."

De gens tres dangereux qu'on appelle Vaudois:
 Lesquelz ont attiré presque de tous endroits
 Plusieurs a leur cordelle, en vertus des fantosmes,
 Vaines illusions, dont ils charmoient les hommes.

L'EVEQUE DE CHARTRES

Quand nous devons juger des œuvres qui sont faicts
 Par la main de Dieu seul, il fault avoir suspectes
 Les façons des mondains: car Dieu ne reigle pas
 Ses faicts selon le tour de nostre faulx compas;

 Luy, des pauvres pecheurs
 Il choisit et les faict de ss Loy les prescheurs:
 Accroysant des sçavants les langues bien disantes
 Par le simple parler des bouches begueyantes.

Ainsi il luy a pleu maintenant d'en user
 Envers son pauvre peuple, affin de renverser
 L'orgueil outrecuidé de ceste gent cruelle
 Par le faible secours d'une pauvre Pucelle.
 Que croire nous devons envoyée des Cieulx
 Si à la verité nous ne sillons nos yeux.

LE CHANCELIER

Monsieur, regardez bien s'il vous semble probable,
 Qu'une fille des champs se soit faicte capable
 Des misteres de Dieu, et revelations,
 Que mesme des sçavans les meditations
 Ne peuvent pas avoir.

L'EVEQUE

Quoy ? trouvez vous estrange
 Qu'a un simple idiot Dieu envoye son Ange.
 Et sur qui a-t-il dict
 Sinon sur les petits que tombe son esprit.

LE CHANCELIER

Jamais on n'a ouy qu'une simple bergere
 Fut choisie de Dieu expresse messagere.

L'EVEQUE

Moyse, qu'estoit-il ? sinon un vray berger
 Quand d'un buisson ardent Dieu lui vint encharger.

LE CHANCELIER

Il ne choisit pas donc ou sa mere ou sa sœur;
 Ou bien quelque aultre femme imbecile et sans cœur.

L'EVEQUE

Mais qu'estoit donc Judith aultre sinon que femme,
 Qui au fier Holopherne hardiment osta l'ame ?
 Qu'elle estoient (*sic*) donc Esther qui si tost eut osté
 Son peuple de la mort et de captivité ?

LE CHANCELIER

Voires, mais celles-la, c'estoient femmes notables,
 Riches et de bon lieu, grandes et redoutables.

L'EVEQUE

Quoy ? la Mere de Dieu la peuvons nous nier
 Que pensée on ne l'ayt femme d'un menuisier ?
 Ains ce sont celles la qui sont les moins habiles
 Que plustost il choisit, se le rendant utiles
 Par sa propre vertu, augmentant leur pouvoir,
 Pour faire ce qui est contre l'humain espoir.

LE CHANCELIER

Ouy, en ce qui est a leur sexe sortable
 Non pas à ce qui n'est rien du tout convenable
 A leur faible nature, en abatardissant
 L'ordre qu'il a ja mis, ce monde batissant,
 Comme à faire la guerre et mener une armée,
 Chose ostée à la femme, et à l'homme donnée.

L'EVEQUE

Mais si nous estimons du tout estre contraire
 Aux femmes de tenter les martiaulx combats
 L'histoire nous dement. Car ne lisons nous pas
 Ce que jadis ont faict ces masles Amazones
 Qu'en la fureur de Mars ont senty si felonnes,
 Les peuples si souvent par elles surmontez
 Des hommes se voyant par des femmes domtés ?
 La femme qui de Dieu est saintement choisie
 Peut plus qu'une qu'espoin la seule jalouse.

These *exempla*, it may be noted, are those also of Alain Chartier's Senecan Epistle and of Christine de Pizan's poem to the Maid, of July, 1429.¹ The cases cited are in turn those of Gerson in the preceding May. His argument in Jeanne's behalf, on high moral and characteristically subtle psychological grounds, is finally echoed by the Doctor of Fronton du Duc, who makes the deciding speech:

¹ Cf. Jules Quicherat, *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc*, V, 131 and 4, Paris, 1851.

LE DOCTEUR

Monseigneur, s'il vous plaist, suyvant vostre chemin
 J'osera refuter le soupçon peu benin
 Du seigneur Chancelier, doutant si l'entreprise
 De ceste fille vient, ayant esté apprise
 Par les malins esprits: car à la verité
 Ceux la que plus souvent on voit avoir esté
 Abusés de leurs sorts, sont des simples bergères.

C'est pourquoi en sondant le cœur de la Pucelle
 J'ay d'elle plus enquis sa vision nouvelle.

Mais enfin nous trouvons que faire il ne se peult
 Que d'un esprit malin ceste vision fust,
 Car combien que ce soit sa fraude coutumière
 Que de se transformer en Ange de lumière,
 Si est ce qu'il y a cela de differant
 Qu'alors que devant nous il se monstre present,
 Nous sommes tous espris d'une joye trompeuse:
 Mais à la fin du jeu une terreur douteuse
 Nous saisit tous le cœur, laissant tous effrayez
 Ceulx que si finement il aurait desvoiez.
 Mais au contraire ceulz que les Heraulz Celestes
 Sont venus caresser de faveurs manifestes,
 De prime face ilz ont quelque peu de terreur:
 Mais estant avec eux ils sentent en leur cœur,
 Une sainte alegresse et au partir nous laissent
 Le reste d'un nectar dont nos ames se paissent.

Estimons donc plustost que la grande clemence
 Du bon Dieu maintenant a regardé la France;
 Qu'il a, ainsi que dict ceste fille, entendu
 Les saintes oraisons qu'au ciel ont espandu
 Et le Roy Saint Loys, et le Roy Charlemaigne,
 Prians sa grand'bonté qu'ores enfin il daigne
 Pardonner aux Françoy, ja de tous mesprisez
 Que jadis il avoit sur tous favorisez.

Car s'il eust envoyé un Sanson indomptable
 Ou bien de Josué la force redoutable,
 On ne verrait pas tant que cela vient des mains
 D'un celeste guerrier, que des pouvoirs humains.

From this point, with somewhat of a truly classic austerity and logical rigor, the Jesuit shows the forces of greed, superstition, and envy undoing the Maid and France, summed up with a kind of Stoic poignancy in the chorus at the end of Act III:

EPODE

Tousjours l'envye traistresse
 La vertu poursuit et presse;
 Mais aussi d'autre costé
 Le los d'une juste gloire
 Faict qu'elle obtienne victoire,
 De l'envyeux surmonté.

There is some hint, moreover, of the poignant sublimity and finesse which one has liked to imagine in a Cornelian play on the subject, in the final soliloquy of the Maid:

Jusques à quand, Seigneur, differes-tu de rendre
 Ce mien corps à la mort, que je ne fais qu'attendre ?
 Jusqu'à quand permetz-tu que gennée d'effroys
 Je meure, sans mourir, et mille et mille fois ?

Fais que je ne chancelle
 En l'espoir de mon Dieu, moy sa plus humble ancelle.

Assiste moy encor; fais que jusqu'à la fin
 Je resiste aux assaults d'un ennemy si fin.
 La mort point ne m'étonne, ayant ja despechée
 L'œuvre dont tu m'avois sainctement empeschée.
 J'ay faict lever le siege et faict sacrer le Roy;
 J'ay mis des ennemys l'affaire en desarroy.
 Heureuse, si j'avois à plain executée
 La volonté de Dieu, comme tu l'as dictée.

The play raises more than one question. Did Corneille and Rotrou know it, finding in it a congenial pattern and inspiration? Had its fame possibly some exciting effect on the first part of *Henry VI*, or are the two plays merely signs of the times, and notable examples of what difference of interpretation is possible for the same events? Such questions are easier asked than answered. The *Histoire tragique*, for its intrinsic merits of psychological refinement, sympathetic justice of comprehension, elevation and pathos of style, deserves respectful memory, at least.

MAUD ELIZABETH TEMPLE

Modern Philology

VOLUME XII

January 1915

NUMBER 7

AN ESSAY TOWARD THE CRITICAL TEXT OF THE A-VERSION OF "PIERS THE PLOWMAN"

The interest of students of Middle English literature in the *Piers Plowman* poems was greatly stimulated several years ago by two articles by Professor John M. Manly, "The Lost Leaf of 'Piers the Plowman'"¹ and "'Piers the Plowman' and Its Sequence."² I was so fortunate as to be a student under Professor Manly in 1905, when his belief in the diversity of authorship of the several versions was daily receiving fresh confirmation from his investigations, and we recognized the need for an adequate critical text in order that the differences between the three versions might be determined satisfactorily. Accordingly, in my first subsequent vacation, in the summer of 1907, I began the necessary work by collating the fourteen MSS of the A-version as far as 8.130 (Skeat's numbering),³ with the object of studying their relationship to one another, and attempting to settle the existing uncertainties of the text. This work I have since been carrying on as time and opportunity offered, and the results I now publish in this essay. The critical text, with the collations, must wait until similar work on the B- and C-versions has been finished (when all will be printed

¹ *Modern Philology*, III (January, 1906), 359-66.

² *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, II (1908), 1-42.

³ This study of the critical text covers only the prologue and the first eight passus to 8.130 because it is at this point that Mr. Manly (and I) believe the work of A1 ceases. This line marks the close of the most vigorous, the most readable, and the best organized part of the A-text.